

Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

Growing Old at the Movies: Cinema-Going As Spatialised Embodied Practice

Thesis

How to cite:

Cochrane, Berry (2008). Growing Old at the Movies: Cinema-Going As Spatialised Embodied Practice. MRes thesis The Open University.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 2008 The Author



<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Version: Version of Record

Link(s) to article on publisher's website:

<http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.21954/ou.ro.0000f28f>

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk

**Growing old at the movies: cinema-going
as spatialised embodied practice**

Berry Cochrane

BA (Hons.), MA

Submitted for Master of Research (MRes) Human Geography

Submission date: 4 September, 2008

Date of award: 8 November 2008

ProQuest Number: 13837973

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 13837973

Published by ProQuest LLC (2019). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

Abstract

In film studies and the geography of film the convention of prioritising the film text as object of analysis has resulted in understandings of cinematic representation that rely on films being a somewhat stable entity with a fixed meaning. Recently both fields have begun to consider the material context of film-viewing alongside the body's role in our understanding of film texts and the value of abstracted film analyses is being questioned.

Engaging with gerontology and drawing on empirical work with women who attend matinees for the over-60s, this dissertation explores how understanding cinema-going as a spatialised embodied practice might impact on conventional understandings of the politics of cinematic representation.

Working through Bourdieu's theoretical framework, supplemented by the adoption of the go-along as method, the meaning of the body in the audience comes to be seen as existing in a co-constitutive relationship with the architecture of the cinema and the film on the screen. Film is seen as becoming cinema via the spectatorial body, requiring a more reflexive and situated approach to film analysis in which the politics of cinematic representation are acknowledged as fluid and (re)negotiated in the moment of cinema-going as practice.

Table of Contents

Aims and Objectives	3
Literature Review	7
Methods	18
Data Collection and Analysis	26
Interpretations	32
Findings	42
Bibliography	46
Appendix A: Sampling	56
Appendix B: Access	57
Appendix C: Observation analysis	59
Appendix D: Categories of analysis, first iteration	64
Appendix E: Categories of analysis, second iteration	66
Appendix F: Interview analysis	69
Appendix G: Example film analysis	76
Appendix H: HPMEC form	77
Appendix I: PI sheet and consent form	89

Chapter One: Aims and Objectives

Despite the relative youth of the medium, film has inspired a range of theoretical attempts to apprehend its 'magic', meaning, effect and affect. Film studies has borrowed from a variety of disciplines to access the meaning of the film experience and recently it has been working with, and has engaged, geography (cf. Clarke, 1997; Bruno, 1992). This has led contemporary film studies away from a focus on the screen and the spectators' relationship to it – often framed in visual and cognitive terms – toward thinking about the different spatialities of *filmmaking* (Fish, 2007) and *filmviewing* (Bruno, 2002; Friedberg, 2002a). Somewhat inevitably, this has coincided with the resurgence of a consideration of the bodily affect of film viewing and the effect of the body on film (cf. Sobchack, 2004).¹

The convention of prioritising the film text as object of analysis has resulted in understandings of cinematic representation – of 'reality' (Bazin, 1967), of race (Stam and Spence, 1985), of gender (Geraghty, 1997) of sexuality (Dyer, 1977) - that rely on films being somewhat stable entities with a fixed meaning. With the gradual introduction of a consideration of the material contexts of film-viewing and the body's role in our understanding of the film text, this method of abstracted analysis is being questioned. My overarching aim in this project, therefore, is to begin to explore how these new ways of analysing film and cinema-going might affect our understanding of cinematic representation.

To combine the often separated categories that make up the diverse disciplinary interests of film studies and the geography of film – the body, space and representation – I will be working with Bourdieu's (1977) understanding of practice. Drawing specifically on his concept of *habitus*, I hope to develop a theoretical framework that enables me to apply these ideas through an analysis of a particular body at the cinema and consider the impact this approach may have on understandings of cinematic representation.

¹ As Sobchack (2000) and Bruno (2002) note, early work on film was concerned with the bodily (cf. Kracauer, 1960)

Objectives

Engaging with Bourdieu's theory of practice implies certain methodological and ethical considerations. In particular, his assertion that much of the meaning of practice is implicit suggests that traditional methods cannot access it. As such, my project also considers how – methodologically – we might circumvent this problem and more effectively 'get at' practice.

My question – how might thinking about cinema-going as a spatialised embodied practice impact on our understanding of the politics of cinematic representation? – is broken down into three smaller questions intended to offer access points to the broader concern. These are:

- What role does the body play in the practice of cinema-going?
- Does the bodily relationship to the screen affect our film preferences?
- What does cinema-going mean to those who attend?

To explore these questions I focus on a *specific* body and investigate these issues with women who attend matinees for the over-60s. In my attempt to override the juxtaposition of body and mind prevalent in film studies, I have several objectives to drive the project forward. I aim to:

- Develop an understanding of cinema that is neither focussed entirely on the visual nor the entirely on the body, but recognises the importance of both
- Build on gerontology's engagement with the spatialities of ageing through a consideration of social spaces
- Improve the connections between method and inquiry in the analysis of cinema-going as practice by adopting innovative methods

In the background to these aims is a desire to extend the relationship between film studies and geography by devoting empirical attention to the impact of space – symbolic and material – on cinema-going, but this is beyond the scope of any one project and here just informs my approach.

Rationale

As we shall see in the next chapter, my decision to look at cinema-going as a spatialised, embodied practice is a response to a gap in academic literature. To refine my question I decided to focus on a specific, socially defined body. While work on film has considered gender (cf. Stacey, 1994), class (cf. Ross, 1998), race (cf. Diawara, 1993), ethnicity (cf. Stewart, 2003) and sexuality (cf. Farmer, 2000); I can find no such engagement with the effect of age on cinematic representation and enjoyment.² This is despite evidence suggesting that age is an important factor in patterns of cinema-going (Hubbard, 2002: 1249; FAME, 2007).

Like the social construction of gendered and racialised bodies, age as a social category is negotiated throughout life. As Hockey and James argue, there are many 'stages', each with their own social meanings carrying social and developmental expectations (2003: 5). Indeed, it is often argued that the 'aged' body cuts across all other social groupings, not only influencing status and social identity but also physicality, demanding renegotiation and constitution of the spatial (Calasanti and Slevin, 2006: 3). When we age, the socio-spatial is written on to and written by the body in a way that is experienced universally, if not in universal ways.

I chose to explore issues of age at the cinema through older people because, as is well reported, Britain has an increasingly 'old' population (Peace *et al.*, 2006: 2). Indeed, in 2008 people of retirement age outnumbered under-16s for the first time since records began (Office for National Statistics, 2008). With the policy focus shifting away from care towards encouraging 'active ageing', in which older people are advised to stay active to stay young, many cinemas now offer subsidised matinees exclusively for the over-60s (Clarke and Warren, 2007: 466). In this sense the audience I studied was already constructed, providing a pre-sample from which I could recruit participants. The selected setting of my research, then, offered my study the focus necessary for a small-scale project (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007: 30).³

² There are, however, oral histories of cinema-going (cf. Martin-Márquez, 2005; Kuhn, 2002).

³ There are other events run by cinemas aimed at people at particular socially defined stages of the life-course. Specifically I found that most cinemas offered a children's cineclub and a

By choosing to study women over 60 I do not mean to imply that issues of embodiment and spatiality in cinema-going cannot be explored through other groups. Each will, however, offer a particular perspective on the practice.⁴

mothers and babies matinee. Both of these are also interesting to me but a comparative analysis seemed beyond the scope of this small-scale study.

⁴ I chose to narrow the focus further and limit my recruitment of participants to women. This was partly due to the small size of the sample, the feminisation of old age (Peace *et al.*, 2006: 4), and the fact that women made up the majority of the audience at these events. But it is also due to an ongoing concern in film studies with female spectatorship, although this is not the main focus of this study.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

My project engages with film studies, geography of film and social gerontology. Despite little engagement between the three fields, they have developed similar interests in parallel and offer ways to think about cinema-going as practice. By responding to the interests these fields share I hope to develop a productive dialogue between their approaches. In applying this soft theoretical triangulation a gap begins to emerge and it is here that my research sits. Shadowing my reading of this literature is Bourdieu's theory of practice so it is to this that I turn first.

Theoretical framework

To Bourdieu, practice is produced by and through *habitus*, and the *habitus* is, in turn, maintained through practice (1977: 78). The *habitus* is Bourdieu's way of escaping the subjective/objective dichotomy prevalent in the social sciences and which, he argues, prevents us from getting to the real, lived, nature of practice (1990: 52). While structuralism misses out on the essence of practice by valuing theory over action, phenomenology ignores the importance of structures on the nature of individual practices (1990: 55). Put simply, *habitus* describes the subjective incorporation of objective structures through which they are maintained and subtly changed. What is essential to his theory is that the structures remain implicit and are reproduced through practice precisely because they are not, and cannot be, consciously registered in everyday life (1977: 79).

The pre-existing fixed structures assumed by objectivism to determine practice ignore not just the researchers' role in generating these structures but also their constitution within a temporal structure (past-present-future) that is played with in the interaction between social actors to generate and imply a *number of possibilities*. These schemes, of playing with time to generate meaning within structures, need not imply that practice is generated by autonomous individuals – they exist in the agents' practice but not in their consciousness or discourse. In Bourdieu's understanding, we unconsciously carry our past experiences with us at all times and they influence our expectations of the future, implicitly determining the decisions we make in the

present and, as such, our practice (1977: 83; 1990: 56). Because of the reciprocal relationship between structures and *habitus* this, in turn, implies that objective structures are produced by past practices (1977: 83).

Key to my work is Bourdieu's argument that structures only become active through the body (1977: 81). To Bourdieu, we learn through the body from early childhood. The dispositions and movement of those around us teach us a bodily stature and comportment that exists in a co-constitutive relationship with the spatial (1977: 90). This results in the development of a body-in-space appropriate to, but unaware of, its position in society: 'the whole system of values reappears through the gestures and movements of the body' (1977: 90).

In differentiated society, members of a group or class are taken to share the same overarching, or 'homologous', *habitus* (1990: 55). This constructs, Bourdieu states, the inner coherence of groups by generating a sense that certain practices are 'not for the likes of us' (1990: 56). That *habitus* are co-constitutive of homogenous 'conditions of existence' allows for shared harmonised practices without the need for consciously structuring norms. These implicit structuring practices are present in all interactions and reinforce social positions (1990: 59). Because *habitus* are socially and historically specific, they are both produced by and producer of the social conditions that determine differentiated society. Bourdieu is careful here to not lose sight of the bodily as he argues that these structures are inculcated through the body into structuring dispositions and so construct similar expectations. Members of a class or group, however, also maintain individual *habitus* (1990: 60).

Fundamental to Bourdieu's theory is that *habitus* works precisely because it makes structures implicit and naturalises objective social positions. Because of this it is what he calls doxa – our inherent and unknown belief in the system – that is of real interest in an analysis of practice as it is with this practical, not cognitive, logic that we act. By providing a way to think about and theorise practice, Bourdieu's theory guides my engagement with the following literature. His emphasis on breaking down the enforced separation

between subjectivity and objectivity has particular resonance in film studies where a division remains between the cognitive and the bodily.

Film and the spatial

The predominant concern of early film studies was aesthetic. Initially focussing on the new medium's ability to manipulate reality through montage and symbolism and arguing for the acceptance of cinema as the seventh art (cf. Arnheim, 1933 in Turner, 1988; Lindsay, 1915), the introduction of sound brought with it an emphasis on realism, focussing on *mis-én-scène* – the arrangement of elements within a frame (Bazin, 1967). This interest has continued but, as narrative conventions came to dominate film form, the artistic intention of the author, or *auteur*, has come to the fore alongside an interest in genre (cf. Wright, 1975; Sarris, 1962).⁵ This, in turn, brought an interest in the nature of cinematic pleasure and the relationship between the audience, the film and society. In the 1970s a new generation of theorists, frustrated by a relatively transparent understanding of film meaning, turned to different disciplinary approaches including anthropology, linguistics and semiotics (cf. Chatman, 1978; Metz, 1974) as well as critical approaches such as psychoanalysis (cf. Mulvey, 1975), Marxism (cf. Comolli, 1977; Baudry, 1975); and Feminism (cf. Creed, 1993; Modleski, 1988; Mulvey, 1975).⁶

Despite being diverse in range, these approaches share a concern with the film text as the object of analysis.⁷ This dominated until the late 1980s when interest in early film brought exhibition practices to the fore (cf. Gunning, 1989). This work varies from historical analyses of exhibition sites (cf. Fuller, 2002), to the business of exhibition (Gomery, 1992), and the impact of the site of exhibition on the spectatorial experience (Jancovich *et al.*, 2003). Arguing that the architecture, history and industry of exhibition sites should no longer be ignored in favour of the film-image, it necessarily pays little

⁵ A genre, such as the Western or Melodrama, is a group of films that make use of common themes and/or narrative conventions.

⁶ These approaches were not mutually exclusive and many film theorists have combined methods of analysis. For example Mulvey (1975) famously developed a feminist approach to film through the theoretical lens of psychoanalysis.

⁷ Although early work on film did attempt to theorise both the relationship between cinema architecture, the spectatorial experience and the bodily experience of film viewing (see, for example, Kracauer's work on the Berlin picture palaces, 1926/1987).

attention to films, entrenching a division in the discipline between the material and symbolic practices of film. However, a growing interest in the spatial is beginning to overcome this division.

Bruno (2002) and Friedberg (1994; 2002a), argue for the adoption of a spatial analysis of film and cinema-going to escape the imagining of the spectator as a disembodied, fixed gaze (Bruno, 2002; Friedberg, 1994). Engaging with Eisenstein's argument that walking through and around architecture is similar to film montage; both Friedberg and Bruno imagine the film spectator as mobile. Bruno (2002) takes up these ideas in her concept of the *voyageuse*, an active female spectator who, in the years of early film, found a new route to public space through cinema. To Bruno (2002), cinema is a medium of travel whose spectators *journey* through film. This character closely links to Friedberg's (1994) *flâneuse*, a female spectator of early film who was at once mobilised by film and shopping, both of which, she argues, played key roles in the feminisation of public space in the early twentieth century. Friedberg (1994) claims that the site of exhibition and the films they screen stem from the same tradition of mobility and combine to create the 'mobile virtual gaze' of cinema (Friedberg, 1994: 89).⁸ Bruno (2002) goes a step further in arguing that spectatorship is an architectural practice (2002: 44). To her, film becomes cinema through its interaction with architecture, encouraging an acknowledgement of cinema as *situated* embodied practice (Bruno, 2002: 44, 48).

By bringing the bodily into the practice of film viewing this work offers a provocative theoretical argument that deserves empirical attention. This attention has, thus far, taken the form of historical analyses such as Stewart's (2003) exploration of black film spectatorship in 1910s Chicago. To Stewart (2003), classical cinema and the city both shaped black people's access to films (how they saw) and their public role as spectators (how they were seen). To understand this dynamic, Stewart suggests a theory of 'reconstructive spectatorship' that emphasises how black viewers reconstituted the racist screen and asserted themselves through their engagement with it (2003: 653). Cinema's status as public practice became

⁸ This gaze is mobile because of its extension of the architecture of tourism such as world fairs and panoramas, and virtual because of its reliance on the virtual gaze of photography.

important to newly urbanised and, therefore, newly *publicised* black audiences who negotiated their public identity in the semi-private space of the cinema auditorium. To Stewart (2003), bodies that cannot insert themselves into the narrative on the screen of classic Hollywood cinema interrupt its preferred reading and problematise its assumptions of a shared narrative.

Stewart's (2003) work represents a long-overdue consideration of the co-constitutive interaction between the body, sites of exhibition and the film on the screen. However, it also serves to reinforce the dichotomy in film studies between the material and the symbolic as she does not provide analysis of the films viewed by the audience with which she is concerned. Sobchack's work is an attempt to free the spectator's body from its desertion by film theory (2000: 3). Like Bourdieu (1977), Sobchack (2000) engages with the work of Merleau-Ponty to explore bodily communication. Through his work, Sobchack develops the notion of a 'cinesthetic subject' whose initial engagement with film is sensual, not cognitive, although the two are not mutually exclusive (2000: 19). Sobchack (2000) argues that, although we do not actually, for example, taste the food on the screen, the lived body of the cinesthetic subject experiences an ambiguous oscillation between the 'real' and the 'as if real' that serves to momentarily conflate the lived body of the spectator and the representation on the screen (2000: 23). Here the meaning of the body and the meaning of the film are seen to be fundamentally co-constitutive in-the-moment of viewing. Reflecting Bourdieu's criticism of scientific flattening of practice, Sobchack (2000) argues that this present-tense, implicit experience, comes to be seen post-hoc as a cognitive representation because sense is 'at once *carnal matter* and *conscious meaning*', with the former devalued in scientific discourse (2000: 22).

By combining Sobchack's (2000) detailed consideration of the body's effect on film and film's affect on the body with Bruno (2002) and Friedberg's (1994) analyses of the influence of exhibition sites on spectatorship and Stewart's (2003) historical empirical analysis of a specific body at the movies, we begin to see the spectatorial body as a mediating force between the diverse elements that make up cinema-going as practice. To develop this approach I

turn now to the work being undertaken on film within geography, by way of further expanding the productive connection.

Geography and film

Aitken and Dixon claim that 'the study of film within the discipline of geography has now come of age' (2006: 1). This is, they argue, the result of a geography of film that has ceased to use film to explore spatial metaphors or as a teaching aid, and become one that productively engages geography's understandings of landscape, spatialities, mobilities, scales and networks (2006: 1). The 'sub-discipline' has used these ideas to explore film while simultaneously using film to extend the concepts themselves. This has resulted in wide-ranging work looking at, for example, national, local and global identities (cf. Acland, 2003; Aitken, 1991); the economics and politics of globalisation (cf. Macdonald, 1994; Natter and Jones, 1993); politics of representation (cf. Creswell and Dixon, 2002; Griffiths, 2002) and landscape as a product and producer of the social world (cf. Aitken and Zonn, 1994; Kennedy, 1994).

The journey to this point has corresponded to the trajectory of traditional film studies. Both started with a concern with the extent to which the world on the screen represented the 'real' (cf. Manvell, 1954) until the 'crisis in representation' challenged the transparent understanding of both representation and real, destabilising the notion that there was pre-existing and fixed reality to which representation could refer. By way of engaging with and exploring this 'crisis' both fields – and many more besides – developed approaches revolving around issues of representation as co-constitutive of reality (Cresswell and Dixon, 2002).

In the geography of film, this has led to a substantial amount of work on the reciprocal relationship between cinema and urban modernity (cf. Farish, 2005; Dimendberg, 2004; Clarke, 1997; Natter, 1994) and, more recently, an attempt to apply the argument to the rural (Fish, 2007). These arguments engage with the historical specificities (social, political, economic, technological) that gave rise to the modern city and to cinema, arguing that one could not have come to exist without the other (Clarke, 1997: 10 -11). By interweaving 'real' and 'representation' this work begins to move away from a

privileging of the cinematic text, considering other sources and understanding film viewing as a haptic rather than optic experience. It is, however, still the film(s) that forms the starting point of analysis, but Aitken and Dixon imply that this is about to change as they call on geographers to look not just at the 'filmic representations of space' but also 'the material conditions of lived experience and everyday social practices' (2006: 1, 4). To date there is one study that attempts to analyse the latter – Hubbard's (2002/2003) exploration of the popularity of the multiplex.

Citing the multiplex as the reason for the resurgence of cinema-going that has taken place over the past 20 years, Hubbard (2002) sets out to understand how cinemas are used by different consumer groups. He explores the 'spatial switching of film exhibition' to out-of-town locations to examine why this might encourage more people to attend the cinema (2002: 1240). Hubbard adopts the 'dual city' model which some cultural commentators have claimed epitomises the postmodern condition – one of fragmentation, insecurity and anxiety in which consumption has replaced production as economic force and identity signifier (Hubbard, 2002: 1240). The 'dual city' is demographically mixed but culturally separate, as 'safe' and 'dangerous', 'rich' and 'poor' coexist but are increasingly, spatially, kept separate (Hubbard, 2002: 1243). Having found that the only notable difference between the cinema-going habits of different social groups is their preferred site of exhibition, Hubbard's question becomes whether or not the appearance of multiplexes as new spaces of consumption on the periphery of the city, and their subsequent popularity, are evidence of this fragmentation being written on the landscape (2002: 1243).

In a variety of ways, including thinking about the ontological boundaries of the body (2003a: 261), the ability to drive to the multiplexes (2002: 1254), the perceived safety of the out-of-town sites (2003b: 63), and the avoidance of the 'Other' (2002: 1253), Hubbard asserts that the draw of the multiplex is the same as the draw of the city-centre cinema: it is the 'riskless risk' of sociability in a predictable leisure space (2002: 1257; 2003a: 267). By raising issues of the body, sites of exhibition and space and relating them to socio-economic conditions to generate an understanding of contemporary cinema-going, Hubbard provides a productive starting point for my attempt to

understand what all this means for the conventional notion of the politics of cinematic representation.

By bringing this work into explicit dialogue with the film studies described above and applying it to the analysis of a specific body at the cinema, I aim to develop a productive interdisciplinary approach to the understanding of cinema-going that includes a consideration not just of the material context of film viewing but also of the film being watched. Let me turn briefly, then, to the last piece of this network – a discussion of work on the ageing body.

Public spatialities of ageing

Gerontology has traditionally been dominated by social welfare concerns, predominantly explored through quantitative studies and aimed at feeding into public policy, maintaining a medically determined perspective on ageing, focussing on negative and 'problematic' old age (Twigg, 2007: 301). While Kearns and Andrews (2003: 16) argue that this is due to the medicalisation of old age in society, other theorists have criticised this approach as reinforcing this attitude toward old age (Twigg, 2007: 285; Calasanti and Slevin, 2006: 14; Hugman, 1999: 194). The sub-discipline of geographical gerontology has mirrored these concerns, developing as a key focus an interest in the demography and spatial distribution of ageing populations and offering predominantly macro, structural understandings of old age (Andrews and Phillips, 2005: 10). However, in the last twenty years, both geographical gerontology and its parent discipline have been influenced by the wider 'cultural turn' of the social sciences and more nuanced studies of later life in which qualitative methods are used to emphasise the heterogeneity of experience in old age have arisen, bringing in and reflecting a concern with the social (cf. Clarke and Warren, 2007; Twigg, 2007; Hockey and James, 2003).

In the 1990s feminism and other critical perspectives exposed the over-emphasis on disease in gerontology and began to move toward a consideration of the body that focused on situated and personal experiences of ageing, not disembodied diseases (Andrews and Kearns, 2005: 14). This has included explorations of the ageing body in medical places (Parr, 2002); work on the importance of spatial context to the meaning of the ageing body

(Gubreim and Holstein, 1999); and the relationship between identity and physical appearance (Öberg, 1996). Originally dominated by the argument that the negative connotations of the ageing body are entirely culturally constructed, this perspective is increasingly being replaced by the notion that bodies matter because they have a material reality – they do not just accept meanings, they generate them (Twigg, 2007; Calasanti and Slevin, 2006). In Hockey and James' analysis, ageing is fundamentally a 'bodily condition' that is (re)negotiated by individuals with access to a broad range of resources (2003: 9).

Increasingly, gerontology has turned its attention to representations of ageing in an attempt to deconstruct negative associations with the aged body. Calasanti and Slevin argue that representations of youthful ageing and the growing anti-ageing industry have made the ageing (or not) body an important part of popular culture (2006: 3). In their research exploring peer relations in old age, Townsend et al. (2006) found relations to be influenced by external representations, positive and negative. They found that the contradictory depictions of old age, either as pitiful and infirm or heroic and active, cause divisions among old people as they 'both internalise and dissociate themselves from the negative stereotypes' concluding that, 'idealised representation of ageing is also ageist and exclusive' (2006: 884).

The role of space and place in producing and maintaining age stereotypes through the creation of discriminatory landscapes that segregate older people in an architecture of ageing has long been a theme in gerontological work (cf. Andrews and Phillips, 2005; Hockey *et al.*, 2001; Hugman, 1999). While Hugman (1999) argues that, 'the ageing body uses space to manage identity' (1999: 197), Laws (1996) is one of few theorists to have considered how a spatial analysis of ageing might allow for a more nuanced understanding of the bodily. In her work, Laws (1996) turns to the reciprocal relationship between the social and the spatial to understand how aged identities are (re)constructed by and reflected in built environments (1996: 91). To take this forward, Laws carried out a genealogy of the spaces of old age, beginning with the poor houses of modernity through to the 'designer retirement landscapes' of today (1996: 96). Her analysis highlights that these new

landscapes of ageing require a very particular 'aged' body, one which remains 'youthful' (1996: 96).

While Laws (1996) is keen to deconstruct the negative associations of spaces of care, her work nevertheless maintains the discipline's focus on medicalised old age, despite the vast majority of people over 60 and under 85 living independently (Andrews and Kearns, 2005: 16; Hugman, 1999: 184). In an attempt to escape an institutionalised representation of old age, several gerontologists turned to analysing the home (Andrews and Kearns, 2005: 17). Moss (1997), for example, undertook research into how women with acute arthritis negotiated their home. In doing so, like Laws (1996), he moved beyond imagining space as a container used by people toward understanding the two as existing in a co-constitutive relationship. I could not, however, find a geographical gerontological study offering a spatial analysis of sociability.

While gerontology has been criticised for its lack of social theory (Harper and Laws, 1995), in the context of this project the discipline's empirical focus offers a rich starting point as a detailed consideration of the embodiment and spatialisation of old age can be productively carried through to an analysis of cinema-going. In imagining the body as mediator between screen and architecture the specifics of that embodiment can offer insight into cinema-going as practice.

Conclusion

It is my contention that the literature discussed here, read through the framework of Bourdieu (1977), points to the desirability of generating an understanding of contemporary cinema-going as lived practice. This requires a consideration of body and space as co-constitutive of practice that chimes with the work on film and ageing discussed above. By drawing on film studies' analysis of film with an interest in the material conditions of cinema-going inherited from geography, via empirical work on the spatialities of a particular body as it goes to the cinema, I hope to access this network of meaning exchange, and explore its contribution to our understanding of the politics of cinematic representation. To provide empirical attention to these

issues I conducted research with women who attend matinees for the over-60s and the films they watch there.

Chapter Three: Methods

The methodological approach one adopts informs the kind of questions that can be asked and, indeed, what it is considered possible or desirable to 'know' (Pryke *et al.*, 2003). Over the last thirty years, the desirability, possibility and appropriateness of 'scientific' methods has been thrown into question in the social sciences, albeit in different ways by different philosophers and theorists (Massey, 2003: 72). Influenced by this and Bourdieu's (1977: 140) assertion that scientific knowledge needs to embrace the ambiguous rather than the definitive, my question is intended to imply the exploration of a subject rather than offer up an affirmative answer. I do not wish to argue for a stable and fixed, universal understanding of cinematic representation. Instead, I want to engage geographical thinking to access an everyday practice from a different angle. In selecting a method, or methods, for my research it therefore becomes important to consider how I might best generate an understanding of three key elements – body, space and practice – and their relationship to the practice of cinema-going, in my research context.

In her discussion of philosophy and research methods in human geography, Graham argues that it is the framing of the 'research problem that links epistemology and social theory to method' (2005: 31). In this sense it seems clear to me that I am asking a qualitative question. Qualitative research design is an ongoing, reflexive process not a pre-determined course for the research (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007: 21). Rather than exist in a linear relationship to each other, the elements of qualitative research maintain constant interaction and reciprocity throughout the research process (Maxwell, 2005: 4). The conventions of writing up nevertheless requires them to be separated so, having outlined my goals, conceptual framework and research questions in the preceding two chapters, I limit this discussion to methods, validity and ethics.

Methodology

To Bourdieu, traditional research techniques leave 'unsaid all that goes without saying' as social agents do not recognise those implicit structures

that govern their practice, and nor do we have the tools with which to express them (1977:18). He urges we escape from the assumption that the essence of practice can be spoken by acknowledging the importance of bodily communication – that which is unsaid (1977: 15). Fundamental to this is a rejection of the notion that practice is a pre-existing 'fait accompli'. Instead, Bourdieu argues, we need to recognise that practices are constantly in flux, albeit within certain objective structures.

As we can see, in adopting Bourdieu's theoretical framework, my focus on practice implies an emphasis on lived experience. It therefore seemed immediately obvious to me that observation of cinema-going would form an important part of my research. However, having carried out a pilot, I was left with the sense that I was making assumptions about practice based entirely on my own engagement with it – Bourdieu's assertion that the 'distant observer' is prone to treat all practice as spectacle and present it on their own terms began to resonate profoundly with my own experience (1977: 1). Interviewing offered the opposite problem. If, as Bourdieu asserts, much of what is interesting about practice is that which is not said then asking questions after the event seemed inappropriate to my research questions. By simply observing, I would gain the essence of bodily practice but little insight into how the actor makes sense of it, while conventional interviewing would deny me access to this essence but enable a more fruitful relationship with the participant.

To overcome some of these dilemmas, I turned to a relatively rare method – the go-along. Here interviews, in the form of unstructured conversations, are conducted while the interviewee goes about their everyday activities. While the go-along is not a solve-all for my ethical concerns, it does seem to encourage a more collaborative research process in which, as Pink (2007) and Kusenbach (2003) point out, both parties develop new perspectives and take part in the construction of meaning. The benefits claimed for this method chime with Bourdieu's concern with the tendency for conventional research methods to absorb the explicit structure while getting at none of the implicit

(embodied) understanding that informs practice (Pink, 2007; Kusenbach, 2003).

For me this meant attending the cinema with my participant (the observation component) and asking them to talk to me about their experience during the trip (the interview component). As I discuss further in Chapter Four, this merging of the two dominant qualitative methods in a best-of-both-worlds hybrid was not always seamless in practice. Like most qualitative methods, the go-along requires a relentless process of negotiation, renegotiation and adaptation as well as some thoroughly disheartening moments.

Nevertheless, as Kusenbach argues, it is particularly well suited to studying spatial practices and, therefore, offered a productive way in to my research concerns (2003: 469).

The go-along (in theory)

Pink (2007), Kusenbach (2003) and, Bourdieu (1977) argue that spatial practices are best understood 'in situ'. Pink (2007) states that by sharing a sensory experience with participants we can more fully understand their perceptions. In arguing for the adoption of the go-along, Kusenbach points out that in observing we cannot pick up on or learn the 'layers and contexts of meaning that subjectively transform a mundane routine into something entirely different' (Kusenbach, 2003: 470). Similarly, those routines can be so implicit that, in an interview situation, the researcher does not ask about them and the participant does not think to talk about them. Instead, Kusenbach argues, by joining the participant in their everyday activities and asking them to talk through them as they go, we are offered an opportunity for a more in-depth understanding of the personal experience of spatial practices (2003: 470).

The go-along (in practice)

The method is quite self-explanatory: you accompany, or 'go-along' with, a participant as they engage in the practice with which you are interested. This moment is not decided upon by the researcher. Instead, it should be an activity the participant would be carrying out anyway (Kusenbach, 2003: 463). The 'interview' element should involve the participant(s) talking you

through their thoughts about, and reasons for, actions, using spatial cues to prompt comments. For example if, like Kusenbach (2003), you are walking with individuals through their neighbourhood, you might expect them to talk about a specific street or house you pass, either relaying an anecdote or commenting on its aesthetic appearance. As with semi-structured interviews, the researcher is not expected to intervene too much. Instead the focus is on encouraging the participant to speak freely. However, there are times when some level of questioning is necessary. For example, the researcher is encouraged to ask questions if they spot what they consider an important landmark.

The intention is that as you engage in conversation with a participant, you are not only paying close attention to what they are saying but also what they are *doing*. By interviewing participants in-situ, you are able to observe their bodily interaction with spaces as they talk about them and use this observation to guide questions and/or interpret what the participant is saying. While, clearly, an element of observation is involved in all interviews (and, for that matter, conversations), in the go-along we are not just observing the participant and their reaction or relationship to an interview situation. Instead, we are able to observe their interaction with others and, as Kusenbach (2003) points out, are therefore more attentive to informal networks of social relationships than we might be in an interview.

Implications

Despite the encouraging claims made on behalf of the go-along, there are certain issues with my adoption of the method that it is worth signposting here. The method seems, to a large extent, to rely on the participant being comfortable with talking about their practices or actions which, in turn, implies the need for a good relationship between researcher and participant – a relationship the time constraints of my study make problematic. Perhaps more concerning is that Kusenbach's convincing argument for the value of go-alongs is based on their functioning as a supplement to, not instead of, more conventional research methods (2003: 463). What is more, while time constraints limit the number of go-alongs I am able to carry out, Kusenbach emphasises the value of conducting go-alongs with a large number of

participants (2003: 463). These points could expose limitations to my use of this method in isolation. However, they also present an opportunity to experiment with the go-along as a method in its own right and to extend it through this application. As such, a discussion of this method runs throughout this dissertation as I use my question to explore the go-along as much as I use the go-along to explore my question.

Visual methodology

There is an important element of cinema-going that my question asks I pay attention to that has not yet been discussed – the film on the screen. Because of this, my project requires the added dimension of a visual methodology.

There are many methods for analysing visual materials (see Rose, 2007). Those most commonly associated with film studies are formalist, requiring a deconstruction of all components of the image. The assumption is that repetitive close viewings of a film, allow us to identify the unconscious or implicit meanings it contains. Meanings that are, in the normal act of film viewing, taken as natural and absorbed without conscious thought. Another component of this is that the film under discussion is often selected because it is considered to be of independent academic or theoretical interest. While this approach to film texts results in rich and revealing analyses, it clashes somewhat with the focus of my question on the spatial and embodied elements of watching a film. By breaking the film down in this way, we strip it of any bodily readings, instead turning the analysis of the film into an entirely cognitive affair (Sobchack, 2000). This, combined with my conceptual framework influenced by Bourdieu (1977) and the nature of the go-along, led me to consider the possibility of carrying out on-the-spot film analyses. In keeping with my justification for the go-along, this is an attempt to capture the in-the-moment reading of film and therefore attempts to more closely match the spectator's experience. While it is clear that in consciously reading the film in this way I am already removed from a 'natural' film viewing experience, I was nevertheless unable to focus on any scene, *mis-en-scene*, or shot for greater length than the participant sitting next to me.

Ethics

In his discussion of research ethics, Thrift points out that what we consider ethical and worthy of ethical consideration is influenced by our philosophical approach (2003: 105). Thinking with and through Bourdieu (1977) demands a consideration of the ethical assumptions present in the very act of research, as well as the nature of the claims we can make from it. Ethics informed my research on two levels: the formal HPMEC clearance gained from the Open University; and the values put forward by Bourdieu (1977) and, more widely, human and cultural geography. As such, while the first part of this discussion is concerned with the formal procedure, the second considers those disciplinary and theoretical conventions that move beyond the bounded definition within ethics committees.

Due to my decision to work with women over 60 the process of gaining formal ethical clearance was a little more complex than it might otherwise have been for a small-scale research venture taking place in a 'public' space. Despite the youngest of the women being just 60, it was decided by the ethics committee that they should be treated homogenously as a 'vulnerable group'. My application was approved only with the caveat that I should gain a Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) disclosure (see Appendix H for my application).⁹ While much of the advice provided by the Ethics Committee was very useful, their labelling of my participants as a vulnerable group posed an ethical dilemma in itself. Working to this definition was necessary to gain clearance and carry out my research, but it also reinforced the imagining of older people that I was, in part, attempting to disrupt.

Another requirement of the HPMEC board is the production of a participant information sheet and a consent form (see Appendix I). They are considered by the board to be evidence of gaining informed consent a concept that is, in practice, slightly problematic. Despite faithfully issuing a participant information sheet to all of the women I worked with, I am almost certain that none of them read it. In fact, they all quite visibly found it a cumbersome and unnecessary document. The consent form was no less problematic and

⁹ A predominantly symbolic move since, due to the short duration of the research and the length of time it takes to gain CRB clearance, all of my direct work with the women had been completed before clearance was gained.

many of the women just signed it and asked me to do the rest (i.e. tick the boxes next to the statements they are supposed to have considered before offering the consent). This may well happen in other research settings with people of all ages, but it seemed to me to cause a particular problem for these women because of the reading required. While I provided large print versions, most of the women still found reading a considerable effort, particularly in the cinema environment. This became an ethical dilemma of a sort – asking them to sign felt like a request too far as it caused the women small but significant inconvenience and yet I did want them to know what they were agreeing to, and to fulfil the requirements of my HPMEC clearance. In the end I got around the problem by gaining verbal consent and agreeing to send the form for signature separately, with a stamped addressed envelope.

The formal ethical clearance procedure focuses entirely on the researcher's interaction with participants, the moment 'in the field'. As Thrift points out, this often results in a process of box ticking that actually removes responsibility from the researcher (2003: 120). My project involved a more active assessment of what was ethically sound. This was influenced by the important shift in social sciences, away from valuing 'objective science' that works to uncover universal truths toward valuing reflexivity and the (politically inspired) acceptance of multiple truths. This does not mean that research is no longer expected to be rigorous, just that it is considered ethically and academically sound for researchers to acknowledge the situatedness of the knowledge they produce, as well as an acknowledgement that what is considered legitimate knowledge is an ethical issue (Haraway, 1988; Rose, 1993).

The iterative approach to research encourages an approach to ethics that mirrors the interactive approach (see Pryke et al, 2003). It is now considered necessary to extend ethical concerns beyond the field (or extend our understanding of the field) and instead factor them into the research design from the very beginning (cf. Crang, 2003: 132; Bingham, 2003). While I had considered an ethical framework before I began to think about the research in depth, the real ethical consideration evolved out of my engagement with the research process. As such, in addition to aiming to make the go-alongs

pleasant experiences for the women kind enough to agree to take part in my research, I have tried in this dissertation to write reflexively resulting in what I hope is an ethically rigorous project.

A note on validity

Instead of aiming for an absolute – and, to him, unrealistic – objectivity, Bourdieu (1977) argues that we should take the demand for rigour to be a call for reflexivity, in which the researcher considers the impact they may have had on the outcome of their research (1977: 105). This requirement is echoed by Hammersley and Atkinson (2007) and Maxwell (2005), but I found feminist methodology literature offered the most substantial consideration of what reflexivity means in practice (cf. Maynard and Purvis, 1994). By bringing issues of power, politics and responsibility to the fore, much of this work argues not just for a description of the researcher's effect on the outcomes of research, but also for reflection on the mess of research so often written out of academic texts. For the remainder of this dissertation, therefore, I offer reflections on the stages of research, beginning, in the next chapter, with a consideration of the process of data collection and the ethics of analysis.

Chapter Four: Data Collection and Analysis

While the previous chapter discussed the go-along as the ideal-type presented by Pink (2007) and Kusenbach (2003), this one is given over to the presentation of what actually happened during my data collection process, reflecting on the strengths and weaknesses of this method and the personal, practical and theoretical struggles with carrying it out. I also discuss, albeit more briefly, my adoption of on-the-spot film analyses. Having outlined the execution and repercussions of my data collection I move on to consider the analysis techniques employed. For ease of explanation and coherence of discussion the collection and analysis of data are here presented as distinct and separate phases of research. In practice, however, my data collection and analysis were intertwined in an iterative and reciprocal relationship, each feeding into and being informed by the other. This approach is often recommended for qualitative research and was made possible by the natural spacing of the go-alongs, determined by the cinemas' matinee schedules.

Data collection

For my go-alongs I accompanied women on their trip to matinees for the over-60s. I undertook eight in total at two different sites – the Rio Cinema in Dalston and the Odeon Cinema in Holloway, both in London. My research involved eleven women as two of the go-alongs were with groups. Having selected the research settings, certain limits were placed on how many go-alongs I could conduct as the screenings themselves were monthly and weekly. I did not engage in formal sampling procedure but did attempt to select a mixture of participants that reflected the demographic of the respective audiences (see Appendix A); although at the Rio this sample was taken from a particular subsection of the audience (see Appendix B). Despite the small sample, the in-depth nature of the go-along enabled me to gain valuable data on the practice of cinema-going through a specific audience group. The shortest go along was two hours, the longest four and a half. Together we watched *The Italian Job* (1969), *Vantage Point* (2008), *27 Dresses* (2008), *39 Steps* (1935), *The Other Boleyn Girl* (2008), *Closing the*

Ring (2007), *Son of Rambow* (2007) and *The Chronicles of Narnia: Prince Caspian* (2008).

I met the women at the relevant box office up to an hour before the film was due to start, depending on their usual arrival time, and once again explained the nature of the research to them. I began recording as soon as I gained permission. Generally the participants were happy to engage in informal chit chat as we set about getting our tickets and refreshments, and I was careful to observe them as they went about these tasks. Once the film began I paid close attention to the physical movements and facial expressions of the participant(s) and conducted on-the-spot film analyses through which I recorded my own reactions. In addition I asked each of the women to stay behind and talk to me about the film we had watched, with varied success.

The nature of cinemas as public/private spaces made acquiring access a staggered process. Although I had to get permission from the cinemas to conduct research on their premises, this in itself did not grant me access to data. Instead, access had to be negotiated in the recruitment of participants and, it turned out, constantly renegotiated during each go-along (for a discussion of access at each cinema see Appendix B).

Despite my best efforts to explain the method, many of the women expected a more conventional interview. Attempting to persuade them to just talk me through what we were doing was not only slightly unclear to the majority of my participants; it also somewhat undermined my status as researcher as I could not live up to their expectations of my role. There is an ethical element to this. Being unable to fully explain to a participant what it is you are asking them to do makes the nature of 'informed consent', insisted upon by ethics committees, ambiguous.

An element of the go-along mentioned by neither Pink (2007) nor Kusenbach (2003) is the considerable influence of field relations on the method's success. Due to the length and localisation of their studies, both writers appear to have had relatively established relationships with their participants by the time the go-alongs were conducted. However, when adopting it as your primary method, it is not always possible to generate such relationships prior to data collection, and this inevitably influences the outcome. In my

case, 'field relationships' were essentially confined to the duration of each go-along and they were constituted and reconstituted throughout. This resulted in an intense but somewhat superficial relationship in which I was constantly aware of the ease of a slip from interested and engaged to over-friendly and invasive, making it clear to me that access did not just mean permission as I had previously assumed. Instead, it represents a more abstract notion of *being let in*.

A note on the go-along

While initially my difficulty in generating rapport concerned me, it had the benefit of highlighting the unbalanced attention I was paying to the interview element, at the cost of observation. This is a danger with the go-along – that rather than pick up on the best of both methods, the researcher falls between the two, neither able to observe in detail nor – due to the distracting nature of the surroundings – conduct a valuable interview. However, after developing the loose structure described in the opening of this chapter I was able to balance the two more effectively and benefit more readily from the strengths of their combination.

Throughout the course of data collection, I became increasingly aware of the physical invasiveness of the go-along. Undertaken in an arena where the participant is carrying out an everyday task, the go-along necessarily removes the boundaries between research and activity offered by more conventional interviews. While initially I found this problematic and uncomfortable as my research went on I came to think of it as one of the method's strengths. Indeed, this physical closeness made it impossible to miss not just the embodied, spatialised nature of the practice I was studying, but also my own embodiment in the practice of research. The uncomfortable element of the go-along prevented me from adopting the role of the distant observer and instead highlighted that, just as I was thinking about the effect of the women's bodies and spatialities on cinema-going so, too, should I consider our co-constitution of the moment of research. And it was not just our affect on each others' spatiality – both also effected the becoming of cinema, as our bodies became mediators between the screen and architecture.

In this way, an acknowledgement of the reciprocal relationship between audience and cinema was pushed to the fore by my selected method. As a result, while I experienced the difficulties outlined above, the go-along did enable me to access physicality and embodiment in a particular way perhaps not offered by more conventional methods. Similarly, by offering the opportunity to observe practices as they happened and speak to the women as they did so, the go-along made it possible to notice elements of cinema-going that were taken for granted and left out of their verbal accounts. In this way, by allowing a distinction to be made between verbalised and lived practice, *doxa* – or practical logic – was highlighted. As such, the go-along seemed a particularly suitable method for accessing *habitus*.

Film analyses

While most of the women were more interested in continuing our previous conversation than offering me the analysis I asked for, the conversation was nevertheless steered by the film we had viewed together. Having watched *39 Steps* with Amarjit, she began talking about London across the decades while Ruby and Evelyn were inspired by *27 Dresses* to discuss the weddings they had attended as well as my own marriage prospects.

My own analyses attempted to capture the bodily sensations brought on by film as well as more conventional considerations of the image (see Appendix G). Writing down bodily sensations as you experience them, though, is not a simple task and it is inevitable that in the act of writing a certain essence is lost. Initially I also found that, like the tendency in conventional film analyses to ignore the body, I was here writing the body in at the cost of the visual. After the first few, however, it became clear that the two were unavoidably intertwined and the scenes that prompted a distinctly physical reaction only did so through the breadth and movement of the image. It seemed to me that the body came in most dramatically when the complexity of the image exceeded the visual, a point that is taken up further in the next chapter.

Data analysis

Just as they influence research questions and methods so too do philosophies influence how we think about analysing data. Whether oral

accounts should be considered viable sources of information or social product has been subject to much debate (Wetherell *et al.*, 2001). But the two approaches are not necessarily mutually exclusive and although I am not adopting a form of discourse analysis to examine my data, the attitude toward talk – that it implies more than it says – influences my analysis (Hammerseley and Atkinson, 2007: 97).

In qualitative analysis codes are not pre-determined but are generated from the data, either through noticeable repetition or exceptional elements (Cope, 2005: 225; Crang, 2005: 224). These codes are not an end in themselves: qualitative coding is an iterative process whereby so called 'descriptive codes' are used to explore more abstract or 'analytic codes' (Cope, 2005: 224). In keeping with the strategy suggested by Maxwell (2005: 96) and Crang (2005: 222) my analysis began before any formal coding, by making notes as I transcribed the go-along recordings and typed up my observations. The spacing of the data collection enabled me to explore earlier go-along material for themes that had emerged from later data collection and vice versa, a method suggested by Cope to enable an open approach to coding (2005: 226).

My core data for analysis were interview transcripts and observation notes and, as such, there were two types of 'talk' being analysed – mine and that of the participants (see Appendices C and F). While my interpretations and analyses were supplemented by notes I had made during transcription, these notes were not themselves analysed formally. In addition to my observation and interview transcripts, I had collected eight on-the-spot film analyses but, again, these served as a tool for comparison in interpretation rather than being subject to formal analysis themselves. The observation and interview transcripts were initially coded separately using the process outlined above but then brought together to highlight points of correspondence and contrast.

Once all of my data was collected and typed up I went through each observation and interview transcript line by line once more to explore any shared themes or patterns (see Appendices D and E). In the end, after four iterations of analysis and gradual collation into a 'coding structure' of meta-categories and sub-categories, I was left with two overarching themes:

'cinematic memories' and 'body and space' (Cope, 2005: 231; see Appendices C and F). In the following chapter these are joined by the film analyses since they also raised some issues of relevance to my questions.

Ethics of analysis

While this process was productive, it also made tangible Bourdieu's (1977) argument that the essence of lived practice is written out of academic research as it tries to linguistically express that which, by definition cannot be said (1977:15). While the go-along enabled me to observe practice in-the-moment, it was unable to resolve the inevitable flattening of this immediacy in analysis and writing up. As Sobchack argues, this is due to the academic tendency of presenting bodily, or carnal, practices as cognitive and conscious ones (2000: 22). While this does not mean the benefits of the method are lost entirely, they are certainly transformed in the process of analysis as practice becomes rationalised.

In a study attempting to be reflexive, it would be difficult to ignore the influence my research interests might have had on the themes I found in analysis. Since, as Crang (2003) argues in his discussion of research materials, the process of selection begins during data collection, the researcher's shaping of the data pre-dates the process of analysis. As I have clear research questions, it is inevitable that what I saw 'in the field' was implicitly shaped by them. There is, as Crang comfortingly points out, no way of avoiding this (Crang, 2003: 132). My collection and analysis of the data, then, does not represent the entirety of what actually happened – it never could – it is instead what happened seen through a particular lens. Another researcher could look at the same data and construct an entirely different narrative from it. This does not mean that one interpretation is necessarily wrong, more likely that both interpretations, and many more besides, are present in the data (Crang, 2003: 134). That all accounts are to some extent a construction, in the sense that they are made, does not mean they are false (Crang, 2003: 138). Indeed, in analysis, I found the process to be like an interview, an interactive process between me and the data, whereby I asked specific questions of it to access the relevant information.

Chapter Five: Interpretations

In the previous chapter, I discussed my data analysis techniques and outlined some thoughts on the go-along. This chapter is given over to a consideration of the data they harvested and results of the analysis process. Rather than present the following as concrete findings or facts, it is my intention to encourage debate by offering some initial considerations of the patterns I saw emerging from the data, and my own sense of the experience. This is not an exhaustive discussion of the data or my reading of it. Instead, I highlight those emerging themes that seem to me to hold relevance to my research aims and objectives outlined in Chapter One. The over-arching themes of relevance are 'cinematic memories' and 'body and space' and here they are joined by a discussion of my film analyses.

Cinematic memories

While I explained to the women that I was conducting research into their cinema-going in the present, each one offered up detailed and rich memories of cinema-going in the past.

Florence: In English I remember seeing it [*Casque D'or*] in the Continental Cinema in Tottenham Court Road. It's not there now... My friend used to have a pass and it took the two of us into that Continental... We were terrible because when you went in the lady would tick it to say you've been that week. The state that card got into because you scratch it off and we'd go again the next day.

Rita: [my cousin] was on the buses and I used to cook then, I used to do lovely rhubarb pie and all that. And I used to make her a sandwich, take them up there... and we used to pay one and six for the front seats but sit in the back, [which cost] two and six, I think it was... And they come up and said to us, 'where's your ticket?' I'd say 'I dropped it' and he'd say 'no, you just paid one and six' so we had to go back and sit in the front.

Ruby: When I was courting, my husband didn't like the pictures very much but I always liked it and I always used to get him to come but...

he used to like to go in the pub and have a drink and then, years ago, before I was married, pubs used to close at ten so we used to come to the pictures and he used to say, 'ooh, there's a pub next door. I think we've got time to nip in there and have a drink before they close'. I never got to see the end of the film. And why I put up with it I don't know.

These reminiscences could, of course, be offered because as older women my participants see them, consciously or not, as an expectation of mine. As Hugman argues, there is a tendency within contemporary society to view the value of older people as precisely this – a living source of historical information (1999: 2). But, even if the reminiscences are offered as an assertion of an inculcated notion of social value, these memories are nevertheless there, with these women, on their trip to the cinema.

Stewart's (2003) analysis of early black spectatorship and the importance she places on the material contexts of film viewing are helpful in this context. Since cinemas in the early twentieth century did not screen just one film per sitting, Stewart (2003) contends, the mixed programme of entertainment complicates conventional attempts to understand black audiences' engagement with singular examples of classical Hollywood cinema. Meanings of these early films, she argues, were not fixed – they instead relied on the other elements of the programme, as well as the embodied audience. While the matinees at the Holloway Odeon and Rio only screened one film each time, I feel that the women's tangible and vivid memories of previous cinema visits and films perform a similar role to the mixed programming analysed by Stewart. This reading chimes with Bourdieu's argument that past experiences, in the form of lived history, influence practice in the present (1997: 83). A sentiment that suggests these past experiences are not only present as conscious memories, but are also inculcated in a more implicit way by the body, forming part of doxa in the present.

Despite birth years varying from 1922 to 1948 and varied socio-economic backgrounds, these women shared many opinions on film. Every participant

said their favourite films were musicals and all apart from Jaqui stated a dislike for sex and violence in film:

Amarjit: Like if you were to see it [*39 Steps*] now, all the women would be taking off their clothes, it's true isn't it? I like that kind of old-fashioned romance and the love, that kind of thing makes it more attractive to watch... But they have new movies, they had *Atonement* and she takes the clothes off straight away ... it is not so elegant now

Anne: I like romantic films! ... Anything you make up I just to sit down and watch it. But I don't like killing, I don't like to see killing.

With the above discussion in mind I began to interpret this through cinema history.

The content of the films viewed at the cinema by these women across the life course will have varied hugely but they would nevertheless have shared a relative subtlety in terms of sex and violence. The Hays, or Production, code which censored the 'moral' content of American-produced films was fully adopted in 1934, only beginning to loosen its tight grip after 1952, at which point elongated kissing was still subject to controversy (Couvares, 2006: 4 – 9). While European films famously offered more sexually explicit imagery, British film censorship mirrored that of America and similarly only began to relax in the mid-1950s (Richards, 1997). Mainstream films, nevertheless, remained visually conservative with violent and sexual content controversial until well into the late 1970s.¹⁰ When read through Bourdieu's concept of *habitus*, these 'shared conditions' of a visual past impose cinematic norms that are not just cognitively absorbed, but embodied. This process of embodiment, in turn, influences the practice of film-viewing in the present as it implicitly brings with it past engagements with cinema, while the film viewed becomes part of this embodiment in the future, creating a filmic homologous *habitus* that can begin to explain such coherence of opinion among a diverse group (1990: 59).

¹⁰ There are, however, notable exceptions to this such as the surprisingly violent *Scarface* (1932).

In this context, a discussion of the women's dislike for sexually explicit and violent films requires a short consideration of the physical sensations at the cinema. The objection to such content played out in the bodily reactions I observed at the cinema – see, for example, Florence's tea swirling during sex scenes and Anne's shrinking in the face of violence discussed in the last section of this chapter. What these reactions implied to me was that such content was not just consciously deemed inappropriate but, because the body has also incorporated norms of cinema-going across the life course, are experienced in the body as uncomfortable physical sensations that are unfamiliar and inappropriate in a public setting.

This begins to disrupt conventional understandings of cinematic representation as the body becomes not just receptor but co-creator of meaning, developed across the life-course and (re)made in the moment. As suggested in Chapter Two, there is a spatial dynamic to this network of meanings and it is to this I now turn.

Space and the body

For the women I 'went-along' with, later life was often seen as an opportunity to take up activities previously unavailable. Florence, for example, took up dancing at 60: 'I wanted to [before] but I never got a chance. Well you don't, do you? Family and everything'. While Jane began art classes: 'I thought, I have never painted but I am going to do it.' It seems that the practice of cinema-going gained its meaning for these women within a spatio-temporal network of carefully planned itineraries of activity, of which Rita, Luisa and Eleanor had the most extensive list:

Tuesday is a keep fit at...Clairemont...Wednesday we go to keep fit at Sothebys...that's Highbury Corner near, it used to be the old Arsenal there..., near the School of the Joan of the Arc...That's Wednesday. Thursday we go keep fit. Oh no Line Dancing at Sothebys and then go to Old Street... for our lunch...and have a game of Bingo. That used to be at Exmouth Market, you know the Holy Redeemer there, that church? It used to be there oh it was lovely in there... but they don't pay nothing for this hall at Old Street so we gotta go down there.

In this context cinema can perhaps be seen as one of the 'resources' referred to by Hockey and James (2003), through which the bodily condition of ageing is renegotiated.

In contemporary western society the cultural and physical conditions of being 'old' imply specific, often negative, connotations (Calasanti and Slevin, 2006). This can threaten, or at least shift, social status developed through life and, when read through Bourdieu, disrupt the *habitus*. Indeed, this stage of the life course seems to be a moment when the dispositions internalised through a *habitus* 'outlive the economic and social conditions in which they were produced' (1990: 62). Framed in this way, cinema-going offers a semi-private practice through which the women in my study were able to (re) negotiate *habitus* and (re)constitute public identities.¹¹ While for Jaqui, one of the youngest participants, taking part in these activities seems to signify unwanted membership of a social group (old):

I am a friend of the Opera House at Covent Garden and it's not because you're over a certain age, but they [the cast] have rehearsals in the morning during the week sometimes so it ends up being 'we elderly' that go along because other people are busy working.

Others seem to be denying membership of another (aged and infirm):

Ruby: I'm thankful every day I come, I make it out. I mean you get some people, especially when they're like on their own and they can't get out much, they're stuck in doors all day. And maybe they don't have a visitor or anybody to talk to or anything all day. I think that must be terrible.

In this context, the importance of cinema-going becomes bound up with this bodily assertion of agency in the ageing process.

Bruno's (2002) consideration of the *voyageuse*, a female spectator of early film who travelled through cinema, offers a way to consider the specific place cinema-going holds in this network of practices: by getting to the cinema one is able, in relative comfort, to go *elsewhere*. This is reinforced by Sobchack's (2000) concept of the cinesthetic subject, in which the lived body of the

¹¹ An argument that again relates to Stewart's analysis (2003: 665)

spectator becomes 'at one' with the representations and spatialities of the screen. And there are elements of the women's own talk that suggest the films we viewed were felt as experiences. All participants relayed full narratives of the films they spoke about and the use of film-as-experience or conversation point was referred to directly by Anne:

If you have any worries as some people say they do, while you're watching that, it takes you to another place, you concentrate on that and don't think about anything else. At all. It's really good to come and sit down and I enjoy it, I really enjoy it... If they [my family] are there, I go home and explain it to them.

and reinforced by Amarjit:

I saw that *Pink Veil* and I thought that was so good...when I went home I went on about the movie so much my son had to tell me to stop

This perhaps also relates to the tendency, mentioned in Chapter Four, for the films we watched to steer our subsequent conversations.

As Bruno (2002) points out, it is not just the spectator that travels through film – films become mobile through them, too. This point can be extended because it is not just the film on the screen or the body that views it that are important in the construction of meaning, it is also, as Bruno (2002), Stewart (2003) and Hubbard (2002) argue, the spaces in which these practices are carried out.

The go-alongs enabled me to observe the women and their careful negotiation of the architecture at each cinema while also becoming aware of my own interaction with the space. In the process, my assumptions about the meanings and uses of what were to me familiar spaces changed:

Using the arms of the chair to raise herself up and holding on to chair backs as she moves along the aisle, Juliet holds the 'door' frame as she waits to exit the auditorium and then re-attaches herself to the banister to get downstairs. Her treatment of the space brings into relief theoretical notions, of architecture being transformed by lived

experience of it, a conversation between the walls and the user that, in this sense, seemed to become more defined by Juliet's expert use of every material element of the space of the cinema.

While we speak Anne uses sweeping gestures to take in the architecture and the screen, talking about it as a lovely place, she pulls the auditorium into our conversation.

While these examples could seem to reinforce Hugman's (1999) notion that the ageing body *uses* space to manage identity, to understand the transformative nature of the engagement I instead turned to Laws' (1996) more reciprocal analysis of the spatialities of ageing. To Laws, the meanings of subjects, spaces and places are relational (1996: 91). Spaces of ageing are both determined by and transform the social processes of ageing (1996: 92). While Laws (1996) does not extend her analysis beyond spaces of care, her ideas cross over into the space of the cinema, and notes from my observations suggest that the co-constitution of space is evident in this social arena too.¹²

This geographical understanding of space implies that the moment of film becoming cinema is effected by the bodies in the audience, just as they are affected by it. This implies an extension of Bruno's (2002) consideration of the architectonics of cinema, in which she uses the architectural site to situate film viewing as an embodied practice. Read through Laws (1996), the spatial strategies described above imply that the effect of cinema architecture on film should not be seen to pre-exist its relationship with the embodied audience it holds. Bruno (2002) implies this in calling for an understanding of film representation as *negotiated* by embodied spectators. However, she does not explore how embodied spectators might negotiate and constitute the architecture fundamental to the process of film becoming cinema.

While Bruno argues that 'different models of spectatorship *are figured in the architecture of the theatre itself*', the issue of potential reciprocity is not

¹² This is, of course, not limited to older people and is part of an ongoing and extensive debate within geography.

discussed (2002: 45, my emphasis). This one-way relationship between architecture and spectator does not ring true in my experience. In undertaking go-alongs at the cinema, I could not help but acknowledge that the body in the audience influences the meaning of the architecture and, therefore, in Bruno's thesis, the meaning of cinema in the moment. Here, as in Stewart's (2003) analysis, the body becomes a mediating force between screen and architecture. If, as discussed, the body embeds the past in the present, then it becomes this past that exists in a co-constitutive relationship the architecture and, therefore, the film. As Stewart (2003) argues, this implies that the film and the architecture are not engaged with by neutral bodies. They are instead socially positioned and determined in relation to each other. None of this, it is important to note, excludes the researcher.

There is, of course, once last area where the body and space becomes important – in the moment of the film being viewed.

Film analyses

While it is hard to observe the bodily responses of another person – or even yourself – to a film, I did pick up on a few external bodily reactions from the women with whom I attended the cinema. Some of these were almost certainly conscious, such as Luisa's acting along to the final fight scene in *Narnia* or Jane's eye-rolling at points in *Son of Rambow*. But at other times I noted bodily reactions that seemed more implicit, or carnal, like those described by Sobchack (2000). For example, all of the women sat far back in their chairs when the film started, as though to let it wash over them, and Anne's physical response to Anne Boleyn's execution occurred almost before the act had happened:

Simultaneously to Anne being beheaded in the film, Anne in the cinema seems to attempt to disappear in her chair. She pushes her head back and breathes in, holding it for sometime, as though the pain is shooting through her.

Florence's tea swirling also seemed interesting:

[The] Film starts and she sits back, positioning herself as though... sunbathing is the best comparison I can draw. She sits almost

perfectly still throughout the film but begins swirling her tea in the first sex scene and does it again in the next... does she feel awkward?

Sometimes these can be conscious responses expressed through the body, prepared for by the build up of tension leading to the moment on screen that causes the reaction. But there are also moments, I think, when the body responds directly.

At tense moments, when either the narrative situation or visual representation outgrows the screen, it seems to be felt through the body before or simultaneously as it is read with the brain. There are things we know and understand visually, things we recognise even when they are unfamiliar, and then there are representations that exceed the visual and cannot be captured in the eyes or mind alone. In my own experience, this seemed to relate to landscape shots:

There is a literally awesome view of landscape, huge and clean and overwhelming with pounding music and speedy sweeping shots cut across flat surfaces. Slowing down when it hits water and speeding up on land, zooming through the forest with such rich and blurry images I begin to feel a bit overwhelmed. Abruptly he stops. I feel winded and exhilarated, as though I have been spat out in 1930s London, the setting of the following scene.

But it strikes me that it could be any number of things. For Anne, for example, it was the violence she outwardly claims to dislike. For others, I would imagine, it will be other things. But this physical response, in which the film speaks directly to the body and the body talks back, is important to our understanding of cinema-going. To me at least, it reinforces the need to understand cinema-going a spatialised and embodied practice.

With all of this in mind, the authoritative voice of film analyses becomes problematic as it denies the effect that the positionality of the academic has had on the meaning and spatialities of the film. In much the same way as Bourdieu (1977) argues that the distant observer is destined to treat all practice as spectacle if they fail to acknowledge the situatedness of their understanding so, too, it should be acknowledged that our social position,

inculcated in the body, along with the material conditions of film viewing will influence our analysis of any given film text. Even Bruno (2002), attuned as she is to the architectonics of film viewing, does not mention where or under what circumstances she viewed those films analysed in the first part of *Atlas of Emotion*. It is this de-contextualising of our readings of film, not just audiences, that needs to be reconsidered to develop a holistic embodied understanding of cinema-going and film analysis.

Chapter Six: Findings

This project has been an exploration of cinema-going as practice, a theme examined by focussing on a specific body at the cinema. While the discussion has been broad there are some key findings and preliminary conclusions that can be identified and I attempt to summarise them here. By way of accessing the main learnings from my research, I turn first to a consideration of the three questions outlined in Chapter One before moving on to an assessment of my chosen method and the implications of adopting Bourdieu's theoretical framework.

What role does the body play in the practice of cinema-going?

While I do not think that these questions can be definitively answered, in analysing the words and movements of women at matinees for the over-60s many of my assumptions about the role of space at the cinema were broken down and debates about co-constitution of spatialities were brought into sharp focus. The go-along made it impossible to ignore the influence of the body in the practice of cinema-going, leading me to extend Bruno's (2002) understanding of cinema as an architectonic practice. It became clear in my research that the meaning of the architecture does not pre-exist the practice of cinema-going. Instead, the two exist in a reciprocal relationship, with the body acting as mediator. In this way, the body is a determining force in the moment that film becomes cinema. As such, it might be better said that film becomes cinema through architecture, *via the specific viewing body*.

Does the bodily relationship to the screen affect our film preferences?

Interpreted through Stewart (2003) and Bourdieu (1977), the theme of 'cinematic memories' encourages an understanding of cinema-going as practice in which our past experiences are embodied in the present. It seems that cognitive memories and conscious tastes are accompanied on their trip to the cinema by our embodied past cinematic experiences, and all serve to influence film preferences.

What does cinema-going mean to those who attend?

Read through Bourdieu's (1990) concept of homologous *habitus*, the women I attended the cinema with seem to use cinema-going either as a way to assert membership to a particular group (in this case of active and fit older people) or as an attempt to learn the practices common to a new(ish) group *habitus* (in this case 'old'). While this is specific to the older women in my study, it chimes with Hubbard's argument that the desirability of particular cinematic experiences is the 'riskless risk' of attending with people from the same social group. My analysis also extends this argument slightly as it questions the existence of a pre-existing class of people which the cinema houses. Instead, cinema-going as practice becomes part of the structure of inculcation of norms that forms the group *habitus*.

Explored further through Bruno's (2002) concept of the *voyageuse* and Sobchack's (2000) cinesthetic subject, we can also see that within the realm of this 'riskless risk' cinema-going provides a specific practice that enables spectators to go elsewhere from the comfort of the semi-private space of the cinema. In this moment of travelling through film, representations are negotiated by and through the body as it becomes absorbed into the screen, a practice that has implications for conventional understandings of the politics of cinematic representation that the go-along enabled me to access.

The go-along

Although I initially found the go-along to be a problematically invasive method, my subsequent analysis and reflections have brought me to believe that this physical invasiveness is, in fact, precisely the method's strength in terms of my research questions. By inserting the researcher in the moment of practice, the go-along demands reflection not just on the practices of those being studied but also those of the researcher. For me this brought an awareness of both the effect and affect that my presence was having on the women's practice.

Part of the method's value for me was created by considering it through Bourdieu's (1997/1990) theoretical and methodological framework. The go-along seems particularly appropriate for attempting to get at the moment of

practice and exploring the *habitus*, because it allows you to compare, or combine, an awareness of what actors say about a practice with what they do as part of it, temporarily exposing doxa – the implicit elements of our understanding, or not, of practice.

This insight developed much of the spatial awareness spoken of in answer to the questions above. In addition to this, the go-along provided me with the opportunity to carry out on-the-spot film analyses while observing the participants.

Bourdieu's framework

To adopt Bourdieu's (1977) understanding of practice is to inherit a concern for the body and for the spatial, acknowledging that representations are not experienced in universal ways as they play out differently in different *habitus*. By offering a way of combining the subjective and objective elements of practice, Bourdieu's concept of *habitus* provided a useful basis from which to attempt to develop an understanding of cinema-going that neither focussed entirely on what is seen nor on what is done. Bourdieu's theory of practice allowed me to read cinema-going in a particular way that highlighted how our past practice impacts on that in the present in implicit as well as explicit ways. This helped me to make sense of the bodily relationship to the screen and relate it to wider debates about the nature of cinematic space and the meanings of film. Of course, following Bourdieu's framework almost certainly also meant I missed out on other elements of cinema-going practice.

At the end of this project my key finding refers back to my overarching question. If, as I argue above, the meaning of the image on the screen does not pre-exist our engagement with it then it follows that the positionality of the analyst influences their reading of a film. Work on the politics of cinematic representation needs to consider what that effect might be. Instead of claiming universal meanings of images we should consider the role that the body and its interaction with the material conditions of film viewing plays in the construction of that representation. Until we acknowledge the nature of cinema-going as a lived – and therefore embodied, therefore spatialised – practice we will continue to apply universal understandings to a medium with fluctuating, contextualised meaning. The politics of cinematic representation,

then, should begin to consider the role the body plays in constructing the meaning of that representation.

This, I think, begins to hint at an answer to Aitken and Dixon's (2006) call for the material conditions of film viewing to be considered alongside the space of a film text (2006: 4). Indeed, the go-along combined with Bourdieu's framework made these conditions practically impossible to dismiss within the moment of analysis – once the role of the body in film viewing is acknowledged and cinema-going analysed as practice, we can no longer ignore its materiality.

Bibliography

- Acland, C. (2003) *Screen Traffic: Movies, Multiplexes and Global Culture*, Durham, Duke University Press.
- Aitken, S. (1991) 'A Transactional Geography of the Image-event: The Films of Scottish Director, Bill Forsyth', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, vol. 16, pp.105-118.
- Aitken, S. and Dixon, D. (2006) 'Imagining Geographies of Film', *Erdkunde: Archiv für Wissenschaftliche Geographie*, vol. 60, pp. 326 – 336.
- English translation available online:
<http://130.191.118.3/Research/Projects/Film/film%20paper1.htm>
(accessed 28 May, 2008).
- Aitken, S. and Zonn, L. (1994) (eds.) *Place, Power, Situation and Spectacle: A Geography of Film*, London, Rowman and Littlefield.
- Andrews, G. and Phillips, D. (2005), 'Geographical Studies: Progress and Connections to Social Gerontology' in Andrews, G. and Phillips, D. (eds.), *Ageing and Place: Perspectives, Policy and Practice*, London, Routledge.
- Baudry, J. (1975) 'Ideological Effects of the Cinematographic Apparatus', in Braudy, L. and Cohen, M. (2006) (eds.).
- Bazin, A. (1967-71) *What is Cinema? Vol. 1 & 2*, Berkeley, University of California Press, Trans. Hugh Gray.
- Bingham, N. (2003) 'Writing Reflexively' in Pryke, M. et al. (eds.).
- Blaikie, A. (1999), *Ageing and Popular Culture*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blaxter, L., Hughes, C. and Tight, M. (2006) *How to Research*, Maidenhead, Open University Press

Bourdieu, P. (1977) *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, Trans. Richard Nice.

Bourdieu, P. (1990) *The Logic of Practice*, Cambridge, Polity Press.

Braudy, L and Cohen, M. (2006) (eds.) *Film Theory and Criticism*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Bruno, G. (1992) *Streetwalking on a Ruined Map: Cultural Theory and the City Films of Elvira Notari*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Bruno, G. (2002) *Atlas of Emotion: Journeys Through Art, Architecture and Film*, New York, Verso.

Casalanti, T. and Slevin, F. (2006) (eds.) *Age Matters: Realigning Feminist Thinking*, London, Routledge.

Chatman, S. (1978) *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*, London: Cornell University Press

Clarke, D. (1997) (ed.) *The Cinematic City*, London, Routledge.

Clarke, A. and Warren, L. (2007) 'Hopes, Fears and Expectations About the Future: What Do Older People's Stories Tell us About Active Ageing?', *Ageing and Society*, vol. 27, pp.465-488.

Comolli, J. (1977), 'Technique and ideology: Camera, Perspective, Depth of Field' in Nichols, B. (1985) (ed.) *Movies and Methods*, Vol.2, Berkeley, University of California Press.

Cope, M. (2005) 'Coding Qualitative Data' in Hay, I. (eds.) *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography*, Victoria, Oxford University

Press.

Couvares, F. (2006) (ed.) *Movie Censorship and American Culture*,

Massachusetts, University of Massachusetts Press.

Crang, M. (2003) 'Telling Materials' in Pryke, M. et al. (eds.).

Crang, M. (2005) 'Analysing Qualitative Materials' in Flowerdew, R. and

Martin, D. (eds.).

Creed, B. (1993) *The Monstrous Feminine: Film, Feminism and analysis*,

London, Routledge.

Cresswell, T. and Dixon, D. (2002) (eds.) *Engaging Film: Geographies of*

Mobility and Identity, Oxford, Rowman and Littlefield.

Diawara, M. (1993) (eds.) *Black American Cinema: Aesthetics and*

Spectatorship, London, Routledge.

Dimendberg, E. (2004) *Film Noir and the Spaces of Modernity*, London,

Harvard University Press.

Doane, M. (1991), *Femmes Fatales: Feminism, Film Theory, Psychoanalysis*,

London, Routledge.

Dyer, R. (1977) (Ed.) *Gays and Film*, London, British Film Institute.

Film Audience Measurement and Evaluation (FAME), 2007 (personal

correspondence 26 August, 2008).

Farish, M. (2005) 'Cities in Shade: Urban Geography and the Uses of Noir',

Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, vol, 23, no.1, pp.

95 – 118.

Farmer, B. (2000) *Spectacular Passions: Cinema, Fantasy, Gay Male*

Spectatorships, Durham, Duke University Press.

- Fish, R. (2007) (ed.) *Cinematic Countrysides*, Manchester, Manchester University Press.
- Flowerdew, R. and Martin, D. (eds.) *Methods in Human Geography*, Essex, Pearson Education.
- Friedberg, A. (1994) *Windowshopping: Cinema and the Postmodern*, California, University of California Press.
- Friedberg, A. (2002a) 'Urban Mobility and Cinematic Visuality: The Screens of Los Angeles – Endless Cinema or Private Telematics', *Journal of Visual Culture*, vol. 1, pp. 183 – 204.
- Friedberg, A. (2002b) 'Spectatorial Flanerie' in Rae Hark, I. (ed.)
- Fuller, K. H. (2002) 'At the Picture Show' in Rae Hark, I. (ed.)
- Geraghty, C. (1997) 'Women and sixties British Cinema: The Development of the "Darling" Girl', in Murphy, R. (ed.).
- Gomery, D. (1992) *Shared Pleasures: A History of Movie Presentation in the United States*, Wisconsin, Wisconsin University Press.
- Graham, E. (2005) 'Philosophies Underlying Human Geography Research' in Flowerdew, R. and Martin, D. (eds.).
- Griffiths, A. (2002) *Wondrous Difference: Cinema, Anthropology and Turn-of-the Century Visual Culture*, New York, Columbia University Press.
- Gubreim, J. and Holstein, J. (1999), 'The Nursing Home as Discursive Anchor for the Ageing Body', *Ageing and Society*, vol. 19, pp. 519 – 38.
- Gunning, T. (1989) 'The Cinema of Attractions: Its Spectator and the Avant

- Garde', in Elsaesser, T. and Barker, M. (eds.), *Early Cinema: Space, Frame, Narrative*, London, British Film Institute.
- Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P. (2007) *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*, London, Routledge.
- Haraway, D. (1988) 'Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective', *Feminist Studies*, vol. 14, pp. 575-599.
- Harper, S. and Laws, G. (1995) 'Rethinking the Geography of Ageing', *Progress in Human Geography*, vol. 19, pp. 199-221.
- Hockey, J. and James, A. (2003) *Social Identities Across the Life Course*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hubbard, P. (2002) 'Screen-shifting: Consumption, 'Riskless Risks' and the Changing Geographies of Cinema', *Environment and Planning A*, vol. 34, pp. 1239 - 1258.
- Hubbard, P. (2003a) 'A Good Night Out? Multiplex Cinemas as Sites of Embodied Leisure', *Leisure Studies*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 255- 27.
- Hubbard, P. (2003b) 'Fear and Loathing at the Multiplex: Everyday Anxiety in the Post Industrial City', *Capital and Class*, vol. 80, pp. 51-75.
- Hugman, R. (1999), 'Embodying Old Age' in Kenworthy Teather, E. (ed.), *Embodied Geographies: Spaces, Bodies and Rites*, London, Routledge.
- Jancovich, M., Faire, L. and Stubbings, S. (2003) *Place of the Audience: Cultural Geography of Film Studies*, London: British Film Institute.
- Kearns, R. and Andrews, G. (2005) 'Placeing Ageing: Positionings in the

- Study of Older People' in Andrews, G. and Phillips, D. (eds.), *Ageing and Place: Perspectives, Policy and Practice*, London, Routledge.
- Kennedy, C. (1994) 'The Myth of Heroism: Man and Desert in *Lawrence of Arabia*' in Aitken, S. and Zonn, L. (eds.).
- Kracauer, S. (1924/1987) 'Cult of Distraction: On Berlin's Picture Palaces', *New German Critique*, vol. 40, pp. 91-96. Trans. Thomas Levin.
- Kracauer, S. (1960/1997) *Theory of Film: The Redemption of Physical Reality*, Princeton, Princeton University Press. Trans. Miriam Bratu Hansen.
- Kuhn, A. (2002), *An Everyday Magic: Cinema and Cultural Memory*, London, I.B. Tauris.
- Kusenbach, M. (2003) 'Street Phenomenology: The Go-Along as Ethnographic Research Tool', *Ethnography*, vol. 4, pp. 455 – 481.
- Laws, G. (1996) 'Spatiality and Age Relations' in Jamieson, A., Harper, S. and Victor, C. (eds.), *Critical Approaches to Ageing and Later Life*, Buckingham, Open University Press.
- Lindsay, V. (1915) *The Art of the Moving Picture*, New York, Macmillan.
- Macdonald, G. (1994) 'Third Cinema in the Third World' in Aitken, S. and Zonn, L. (eds.).
- Manvell, R. (1956) 'Geography and the documentary film', *The Geographical Magazine*, vol. 29, pp. 417-422.
- Martin-Márquez, S. (2005) 'Sex in the Cinema: Film-going Practices and the Construction of Sexuality and Ideology in Franco's Spain', *Studies in Hispanic Cinemas*, vol.2, pp.117 – 124.
- Massey, D. (2003) 'Imagining the Field' in Pryke, M. et al. (eds.).

Maynard, M. and Purvis, J. (1994) (eds.) *Researching Women's Lives from a Feminist Perspective*, London, Taylor and Francis.

Maxwell, J. (2005), *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*, London, Sage.

Metz, C. (1974) *Film Language: A Semiotics of the Cinema*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press. Trans. Michael Taylor.

Modleski, T. (1988) *The Woman Who Knew Too Much: Hitchcock and Feminist Film Theory*, New York, Methuen.

Moss, P. (1997) 'Negotiating Spaces in Home Environments: Older Women Living with Arthritis', *Social Science and Medicine*, vol. 45, pp. 23–33.

Mulvey, L. (1975) 'Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema', *Screen*, vol. 16 no. 3, pp. 6–18.

Murphy, R. (1997) (ed.) *The British Cinema Book*, London, British Film Institute.

Natter, W. and Jones, J.P. (1993). 'Pets or Meat: Class, Ideology and Space in *Roger & Me*', *Antipode*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 140–58.

Natter, W. (1994) 'The City as Cinematic Space: Modernism and Place in *Berlin, Symphony of a City*', in Aitken, S. and Zonn, L. (eds.).

Öberg, P. (1996) 'The Absent body – A Social Gerontological Paradox' in *Ageing and Society*, vol. 16, pp. 701 – 719.

Office for National Statistics (2008)

<http://www.statistics.gov.uk/cci/nugget.asp?id=949> (accessed Sunday 24 August, 2008)

Parr, H. (2002) 'Medical Geography: Diagnosing the Body in Medical and

- Health Geography, 1999-2000', *Progress in Human Geography*, vol. 26, pp. 240 -251.
- Peace, S., Holland, C. and Kellaheer, L. (2006) *Environment and Identity in Later Life*, Berkshire, Open University Press.
- Pink, S. (2007), 'Walking with Video', *Visual Studies*, vol. 22, no.3, pp. 240-252.
- Potter, S. (2006) (ed.) *Doing Postgraduate Research*, London, Open University and Sage.
- Pryke, M., Rose, G. and Whatmore, S. (2003) (eds.), *Using Social Theory: Thinking through Research*, London, Open University and Sage.
- Rae Hark, I. (2002) (ed.) *Exhibition, the Film Reader*, London, Routledge.
- Richards, J. (1997) 'British Film Censorship' in Murphy, R. (ed.).
- Robertson, R. (1999), 'Beyond Twister: A Geography of Recreational Storm Chasing on the Southern Plains', *The Geographical Review*, vol. 89, pp. 533 – 553.
- Rose, G. (1993) *Feminism and Geography*, Oxford, Polity Press.
- Rose, G. (2007) *Visual Methodologies: An Introduction to the Interpretation of Visual Materials*, London, Sage.
- Ross, S. (1998) *Working –class Hollywood: Silent Film and the Shaping of Class in America*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Sarris, A. (1962) 'Notes on the *Auteur* Theory in 1962' in Mast, G. and Cohen, M. (1979) (eds.) *Film Theory and Criticism*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Silverman, K. (1996) *Threshold of the Visible World*, London, Routledge.

- Sobchack, V. (2000) 'What my Fingers Knew: The Cinesthetic Subject, or Vision in the Flesh', *Sense of Cinema*, Issue no. 5. Available online at: www.sensesofcinema.com/contents/oo/5/fingers.html (accessed 29 May 2008).
- Sobchack, V. (2004) *Carnal Thoughts: Embodiment and Moving Image Culture*, Berkley, University of California Press.
- Stacey, J. (1994) *Star Gazing: Hollywood Cinema and Female Spectatorship*, London, Routledge.
- Stam, R. and Spence, L. (1985) 'Colonialism, Racism, and Representation: An Introduction' in Braudy, L and Cohen, M. (2006) (eds.).
- Stewart, J. (2003) 'Negroes Laughing at Themselves? Black Spectatorship and the Performance of Urban Modernity', *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 29, pp. 650 – 677.
- Thrift, N. (2003) 'Practising Ethics', in Pryke, M. et al. (eds.).
- Townsend, J., Godfrey, M. and Denby, T. (2006) 'Heroines, Villains and Victims: Older People's Perceptions of Others', *Ageing and Society*, vol. 26, pp. 883-900.
- Turner, G. (1988/1999) *Film as Social Practice* (3rd edition), London, Routledge.
- Twigg, J. (2007) 'Clothing, Age and the Body: A Critical Review', *Ageing and Society*, vol. 27, pp. 285 – 305.
- Wetherell, M., Taylor, S. and Yates, S. (2003) (eds.) *Discourse as Data: A Guide for Analysis*, London, Open University Press and Sage.
- Wright, W. (1975) *Six Guns and Society: A Structural Study of the Western*,

Berkeley, University of California Press.

Zaniello, T. (2007) *The Cinema of Globalisation: A Guide to Films About the New Economic Order*, New York, Cornell University Press.

Appendix A: Sampling

The audience at the Rio regularly exceeds 250 and is predominantly made up of White and West Indian women with around ten Asian people. Ages range from 60 – 92, plus younger carers or family members accompanying women over-60. I undertook go-alongs with four women, all individually.

The Rio

Go-along	Name	Age	Ethnicity
1	Florence	84	White (British)
2	Amarjit	60	Asian (British)
3	Juliet	65	White (Colombian)
4	Anne	80	Black (Dominican)

The Holloway Odeon has a much smaller audience, generally not exceeding 20, and it is predominantly white women with one or two West Indian women, ages ranging from 65 – 88. There were no carers or family members in the audience for the duration of my research. Here I undertook go-alongs with seven women - two individually plus a couple and a group of three.

The Holloway Odeon

Go-along	Name	Age	Ethnicity
1	Jaqui	65	White (British)
2	Ruby	74	White (British)
	Evelyn	Age unknown – 70s	White (British)
3	Jane	86	White (British)
4	Rita	78	Italian (British)
	Luisa	69	White (Venezuelan)
	Eleanor	76	White (Irish)

Appendix B: Access

I gained access to the Rio relatively early in my research through contact with the person responsible for the classic matinees there. While I do not believe there was any intention of influencing the outcome of my research, my contact at the Rio did have some effect on my data collection, specifically with regard to the recruitment of participants. Noticing my nerves on the first day, she kindly suggested I focus on the balcony audience as she found them to be more responsive. As a result the women I worked with at the Rio were those able bodied enough to sit manage the stairs which meant my sample became representative of this sub-section of the audience, but not of the audience as a whole, which did include more infirm members. However, as Hammersley and Atkinson (2007: 58) argue, access is a balancing act during which you will inevitably experience gains and losses. In this instance, while I lost the opportunity for true representativeness within my sample, I was able to get myself in a more optimum position for data collection with fewer explicit ethical issues.

In the Odeon, the problem was of a different kind. Although I gained permission to conduct research at the 'senior screen' events held there, this came from the head office and was the limit of my communication with them¹³. I received no guidance or any interest from the staff at the cinemas. While this meant that my recruitment was not influenced by a gatekeeper, it nevertheless affected it. Recruitment and access at the Odeon was a much more difficult affair, partly because of the lack of gatekeeper but also because of the fundamentally different atmosphere at this event. While the Rio Classic Matinee is a free event with free tea and cake, held at a community cinema to a packed audience made up of residents of care homes, members of groups, individuals and couples, the Odeon Senior Screen is offered at a reduced rate of £3.50 with a free tea and biscuit held at a chain cinema with a commercial sponsor to an empty and fragmented audience that did not exceed 25 people during my data collection period. This appeared to have a substantial effect on the networks of sociability,

¹³ This is not for want of trying. I sent several emails and made phone calls in an attempt to speak to someone about the events but all of my subsequent attempts at contact were ignored.

communication and openness constituted there which combined to form an environment far more hostile to an 'outsider' such as me.

Appendix C: (tidied up) Observation Data Analysis, all iterations

In walks Florence, a small neat woman with short white hair, a patent boxy handbag and navy trouser suit. She has an Eiffel Tower pin on her lapel and is carrying a silk scarf. She heads straight to collect her ticket. Striding and purposeful. I wait for her to walk toward the bar before greeting her. Painfully aware of my physicality – next to her delicate tidiness I feel cumbersome and messy, clumsily amending her interaction with the space.

Heads to bar for tea and cake, greets Jemma. Seems slightly hazed, on auto pilot. Asks me if it's alright to go upstairs. I take her tea and cake and we go upstairs. She is slow but elegant as we walk up. Stopping on the landing and taking small steps. It is a purposeful and concentrated walk. On entering the balcony she stops and stares straight ahead, explains that it is to let her eyes adjust. Walks us to the same place I first met her. She wants the aisle seat so I get in next to her. Begin to talk about my research, cinema and so on and she purposefully drinks her tea. It is like no movement of gesture is lost. I notice when I talk everything is moving, flailing about, she is minimal and purposeful in her movement. Doesn't translate into coldness, she is engaged in what is being said but her body is careful with its movement...

Points at the screen when she talks about film

Film starts and she sits back, positioning herself as though... sunbathing is the best comparison I can draw. She sits almost perfectly still throughout the film but begins swirling her tea in the first sex scene and does it again in the second... does she feel awkward? Doesn't join in with the general chat happening across the cinema – noisy laughter whenever sex or death is on screen.

Extract	Descriptive (iteration 1)	Descriptive (iteration 2)	Analytical (iteration 3)	Overarching (iteration 4)
In walks Florence, a small neat woman with short white hair, a patent boxy handbag and navy trouser suit. She has an Eiffel Tower pin on her lapel and is carrying a silk scarf. She heads straight to collect her ticket. Striding and purposeful. I wait for her to walk toward the bar before greeting her. Painfully aware of my physicality – next to her delicate tidiness I feel cumbersome and messy, clumsily amending her	Appearance Travel Elegance Intentional activity Body in space/bodies constituting space of the go-along Neat in movement	Personal appearance – neatness ‘well turned out’ Mobility signifier? Regularity of activity – itinerary/ownership. Space/place - Networks of spatialities Physicality – physical	Personal appearance. Bodily markers of ageing/adaption of clothing. <i>Habitus</i> through clothes? Mobility and movement Activity/ Structure and temporality Embodiment of researcher/ bodily interaction imp to go-along. Written out of texts. Bodily (re)constitution of	Agency expressed through the body ↓ Body

interaction with the space.	and in dress	ownership of space/activity	space	Body/space
Heads to bar for tea and cake, greets Jemma. Seems slightly hazed, on auto pilot. Asks me if it's alright to go upstairs. I take her tea and cake and we go upstairs. She is slow but elegant as we walk up. Stopping on the landing and taking small steps. It is a purposeful and concentrated walk. On entering the balcony she stops and stares straight ahead, explains that it is to let her eyes adjust. Walks us to the same place I first met her. She wants the aisle seat so I get in	Familiarity with people and the design of the cinema Polite Physicality/navigation Management of familiar place Physical limitations recognised and managed Regulation/ritual/prefe rence	 Place/space – reclamation or claiming of social space Physicality – limitations and management Space/place – ownership	Co-constitution of space through practice and use Mobility and movement – bodily restrictions to the constitution of space. Structure and spatiality?	Agency through the body and space (bodily agency?) Agency through constitution of space – act of going upstairs Bodily management of space – not necessarily

<p>next to her. Begin to talk about my research, cinema and so on and she purposefully drinks her tea. It is like no movement of gesture is lost. I notice when I talk everything is moving, flailing about, she is minimal and purposeful in her movement. Doesn't translate into coldness, she is engaged in what is being said but her body is careful with its movement...</p>	<p>How people consume...</p> <p>Minimal/managed movement/considered</p> <p>Mobility? Limits or as always? Takes up less space...</p>	<p>Consumption – of food, relation to spatiality.</p> <p>Physicality and mobility</p>	<p>Mobility and movement</p> <p>Bodily communication.</p>	<p>conscious or explicit, just regular. Inculcation</p> <p>Body – limitations managed through movement and tone</p>
<p>Points at the screen when she talks about film</p> <p>Film starts and she sits back,</p>	<p>Presence of screen in conversation</p> <p>Physical response to</p>	<p>Place/space – networks of spatiality</p>	<p>Consumption – of film. Let it 'wash over' – physicality of</p>	<p>Bodily/spatial engagement with physical presence of screen</p>

positioning herself as though...	cinema	Embodied reaction/activity	film viewing. Bodily	
sunbathing is the best comparison I can draw. She sits almost perfectly still throughout the film but begins swirling her tea in the first sex scene and does it again in the second... does she feel awkward? Doesn't join in with the general chat happening across the cinema – noisy laughter whenever sex or death is on screen.	Brevity of movement continues Tangible physical response to film Sociability of the film viewing	Mobility – management of body through ownership of movement Embodied reaction/activity Networks of sociability. Memories? Learned response to screen – cultural/temporal?	preparation for film. Reactions to film – physicality on screen reciprocity with physicality off. Temporally determined expectations of film viewing – no longer acceptable behaviour	Body Bodily cinematic memories...

Appendix D: Categories – First Iteration

1. Not wanting to be made a fool of
2. Not giving up
3. Specifics of past and present
4. Choice in attending matinees – not because of loneliness
5. Food as relationship
6. More time than before
7. Learning from family
8. Family as companion
9. Parental influence
10. Family as connector – women
11. Ownership of experience
12. Ownership of cinema/event/body
13. Feeling of being ignored
14. Leisure as duty
15. Collectivity/Solidarity
16. Clothes/personal appearance
17. Men (as isolated)
18. Couples as isolating
19. Femaleness (of spaces)
20. Suffering of others (previous generations/different cultures/friends)
21. Stars
22. Memories (through film/through place)

23. Temporality (past and present but not future)
24. Days of the week
25. Busyness
26. Activity (intellectual and physical)
27. Money (cheap/free, expensive, food/health)
28. Ownership of the body
29. Prevention of activity
30. Ability
31. New things/opportunities of ageing (free time/pick things up you never had before)
32. Isolation
33. Sex (lack of/distaste for)
34. Independence
35. Control
36. Health (of others/connected to food/psychological and physical)
37. Travel/mobility
38. Place/location

Appendix E: Categories of Analysis – Second Iteration

1. Control

- Over me (researcher)
- Over body
- Over time
- Over identity

2. Health

- Of others
- Connected to food
- Psychological and physical

3. Place/space

- Location
- Network of spatialities – reconstituted for navigation between activity
- Reclaiming social space
- Place, memory and identity
- Place, memory and ownership

4. Mobility

- Travel
- Dance
- Networks of sociability

5. Activity

- Opportunities of ageing

- Free time
- Intellectual
- Joining in
- Itineraries of activities – strict timetable
- Temporality
- As duty

6. Physicality

- Physicalities/embodiment of activity
- Ownership/management of the body through maintaining health/through being informed
- Limits posed on activities

7. Money

- Personal relationship to it
- Others' relationship to it
- Pension management
- Work histories

8. Suffering of others

- Rio Cinema
- Other cultures
- Partners/friends/relatives
- Previous generations
- Audience members

9. Memories of cinema

- Through stars

- Through relationships
- Through place

10. Personal appearance

- Of others
- Of self
- Conventions of dress
- Hair
- Body management through style
- Eating/food management

Appendix F: (tidied up) Example of 'Interview' Data Analysis, all iterations

Well, on Friday afternoons there's a club. In the Lilian Bayliss Theatre. See the side theatre there, And, um, they have speakers. It's always to do with the theatre. It's Ballet, people come from the ballet to speak to us. You have workshops, you can take part. It's marvellous there. That's the Lilian Bayliss Friday afternoons. Every Friday afternoon, 2 o Clock. And they have different speakers, and entertainment all the time. And now they're going out, they're going to, um, Kenwood. They're all going to meet up at Kenwood I noticed. I'm not going though. Actually. And um there's a tour been arranged to take them round the house. Ever been to the house?

Yeah, it's beautiful. Why are you not going?

I have to go and get my feet done. And I've already cancelled that twice. I don't mind. It clashes with something else, a doctors appointment. I had to go to Whittington Hospital. And I couldn't put that off and it's just unfortunate clash. It can't be helped. I think this is tomorrow at 12 o clock down at the Peacock theatre? There's a junior show of all the tinies giving it a ballet. Afternoon. It is sweet, you wanna watch it. I went last year and it was marvellous. Oh little eight year olds. You know, how do they remember? That's tomorrow if you wanna go down there. It's a pound. Charge you a pound for that.

Did you used to dance?

I was a part of the Lilian Bayliss performance group. We travelled all over the place and the queen came once, we danced for her. Oh we travelled.

So how old were you when you started doing that?

Well, I was sixty. I was sixty then.

Did you dance before?

No, never. I wanted to but I never got a chance. Well you don't, do you, family and everything. No I enjoyed that. You rehearse for that in the morning

of the Friday, see. If you wanted to see the group that's there still in rehearsal you go Friday morning. Watch. I am sure they wouldn't mind you watching.

Extract	Descriptive (iteration 1)	Descriptive (iteration 2)	Analytical (iteration 3)	Overarching (iteration 4)
Well, on Friday afternoons there's a club. In the Lilian Bayliss Theatre. See the side theatre there, And, um, they have speakers. It's always to do with the theatre. It's Ballet, people come from the ballet to speak to us. You have workshops, you can take part. It's marvellous there. That's the Lilian Bayliss Friday afternoons. Every Friday afternoon, 2 o	Days/timetable Location – Lilian Bayliss	Activity – itineraries of activity Place/space	Structure and temporality	Agency
	Theatre/culture/ballet	Activity – mental/cultural	Consumption (of culture)	
	Activities (collective)	Networks? Activity – physical	Mobility/movement	Body
	Timetable	Activity – itineraries of activity	Structure and temporality	Agency

Clock. And they have different speakers, and entertainment all the time. And now they're going out, they're going to, um, Kenwood.	Activity/mobility	Activity – mental/cultural	Consumption (of culture)	Agency
I have to go and get my feet done. And I've already cancelled that twice. I don't mind. It clashes with something else, a doctors appointment. I had to go to Whittington Hospital. And I couldn't put that off and it's just unfortunate clash. It	Body disrupting activity Busyness Medical appointments Medical spaces Acceptance/busyness	Physicality – limits of Activity – itineraries of activity Place/space – medical Control – over time/body	Activity – physical/medical Structure and temporality Activity	Body Agency

can't be helped. I think this is tomorrow at 12 o'clock down at the Peacock theatre? There's a junior show of all the tinies Giving it a ballet. Afternoon. It is sweet, you wanna watch it. I went last year and it was marvellous. Oh little eight year olds. You know, how do they remember? That's tomorrow if you wanna go down there. It's a pound. Charge you a pound for	Timetable/days of the week Location Cuteness of others Activity Caring about others/cuteness Days of the week Money	Activity – itineraries Place/space – location Networks of sociability – others Activity – temporality Caring for others Money – advising others	Structure and temporality Rhetoric of care? Certainly asserting something over them in a maternal way...	Agency
--	---	--	---	--------

that.	Past experiences	Memories/identity	Networks of sociability	
I was a part of the Lilian Bayliss performance group. We travelled all over the place and the queen came once, we danced for her. Oh we travelled.	Travel	Mobility - travel		
R: <i>So how old were you when you started doing that?</i>	Dancing/past movement/body	Mobility - dance	Mobility and movement	Body
Well, I was sixty. I was sixty then.	Age – time of experiences	Memory		
R: <i>Did you dance before?</i>				

No, never. I wanted to but I never got a chance. Well you don't, do you, family and everything. No I enjoyed that. You rehearse for that in the morning of the Friday, see. If you wanted to see the group that's there still in rehearsal you go Friday morning.	Past restrictions	Activity – opportunities in later life	Activity /responsibilities	Agency
	Responsibilities/freedom of ageing			
	Calendar/timetable (past)			
	Advising me	Control – over research/me	Structure and temporality	Agency
	Timetable			

Appendix G: Example Film Analysis – *The Other Boleyn*

Girl

The film opens with idyllic scenes of country life – men and women dance around with free-flowing hair as the camera circles them, laughter floats up in the air. Such predictable cinematic conventions do not appear to please the audience their temporary stillness, facing the screen in preparation for the film begins to disintegrate. At this stage my body is cold to the image on the screen – sometimes you feel nothing. The whole audience erupts into laughter when Anne is advising Mary about sex.

The film makes conscious and consistent use of dark and light, emphasising shadows to increase tension. In fact, as soon as the plan is hatched to set Anne up with the King, any scenes involving private conversations or illicit acts are filmed as though the audience is standing outside of the room, looking in through the keyhole. As the narrative develops this technique becomes quite intense. As Anne's behaviour becomes more controlled by others the screen reflects her claustrophobia. Through their relationship(s) with the king, the Boleyn girls' private lives have become a matter of the state. As such, whenever any 'private' experience is had, the camera angle implies that everything they do is watched, it is of public interest. In these times, when children meant future Kings, the King's mistress was public property. In contrast to the open and light feeling of the countryside, the castle begins to feel claustrophobic, everything enclosed and interrelated. The image on the screen reflects the increasingly complex and twisted narrative, as well as the relationship between characters.

Mary escapes the castle and rides across sweeping landscapes, after such a heavy sense of space and restricted movement, both the light on the screen and the powerful sound of the horse's hooves pounding on the ground feel exhilarating. Again representative of the narrative – unbeknownst to her, Mary is escaping death. While there are many

shots of Mary returning to the castle, the restrictive lighting never returns other than in the king's chamber where it continues to reflect his entrapment in his desire. As the camera pulls out to reveal Anne leaning down for her beheading, the entire auditorium pulls back further into their seats. Anne (who I am at the cinema with) has a sharp intake of breath.

Appendix H: HPMEC Form

Title of project

A short, descriptive title.

Growing old at the movies: Cinema-going as embodied practice

Schedule

Time frame for the research and its data collection phase(s).

My research will commence once ethics approval is granted, with empirical work beginning as soon after this date as can be arranged. I aim to conduct eight 'go-alongs' at two cinemas in London between this date and 1 July 2008. Exact dates to be confirmed with participants.

Abstract

A summary of the main points of the research, understandable by a non-specialist.

Recent work in cinema studies has aimed to move away from an understanding of film-viewing as a purely optic experience to one that takes the body into consideration. Despite this, very little empirical work has been done to explore the ideas raised by this new understanding. By engaging in geographical analyses of space and undertaking research with older women, I aim to explore the ways in which cinema is (re)constructed by, and used to (re)construct, embodied identities. I am concerned with how an analysis of cinema-going as a spatial, embodied practice might question existing understandings of the politics of cinematic representation as specific to the image on the screen.

Source(s) of funding

Details of the external or internal funding body (e.g. ESRC, MRC).

This research will be funded by the ESRC as part of my 3+1 Studentship in the Geography Department at the OU.

Justification for research

What contribution to knowledge, policy, practice, and people's lives the research will make?

Because of the interdisciplinary nature of my project, there are three academic fields that I hope to contribute to through my project:

Cinema Studies

Despite the recent shift in emphasis to the spatial, embodied elements of cinema-going, very little empirical work has been done to explore the spatial practices of cinemagoers themselves. Such an investigation has value to this field as it offers further depth to the theoretical work in this area, exploring how it might valuably interact with the lived experience of people at the cinema. By carrying out and analysing the research from a geographical perspective I hope to deepen what I consider to be a very valuable relationship between geography and cinema studies.

Geography

Although a 'geography of film' does exist it has not capitalised on the recent, more geographical work in cinema studies and instead tends to focus on the film texts. By looking at cinema-going as a spatial practice I hope to enrich the discipline's engagement with film beyond the image on the screen, toward a more embodied understanding of spectatorship. By engaging with geographical analyses of space and embodiment through empirical work on cinema-going I aim to build on the shared interest of these fields of research.

Gerontology

The field of gerontology - including geographical gerontology and social gerontology – offers insight into the lives of older people but its traditional focus on informing policy has tended toward an emphasis on those older people in need of care, either at home or in residential care homes. My project is interested in how older/ageing bodies renegotiate their changing identities and status through the public/private world of the cinema. Very little work has been done in the field of gerontology on the public life of older people but there is a developing interest in this area. I hope that, through the consideration of how cultural representations in the cinema play out differently on an ageing body, and how these representations are used to (re)negotiate public identities in a semi-private space, my work on the topic offers something to this growing field.

I cannot imagine my MRes dissertation having much of an effect on policy.

However, through this research, I hope to add to the existing work attempting to break down the negative stereotyping of older people in British society as well as deconstructing the imagining of older people as a homogenous group.

Investigators

Give names and units of all persons involved in the collection and handling of individual data.

Please name one person as Principal Investigator (PI).

Berry Cochrane (PI)

Supervisors: Professors Gillian Rose and Kevin Hetherington (Geography department)

Published ethical guidelines to be followed

For example: BERA, BPS, BSA (see Research Ethics web site for more information).

ESRC and Open University guidelines

Location(s) of data collection

Give details of where and when data will be collected. If on private, corporate or institutional premises, indicate what approvals are gained/required.

There are two sites of research:

1. The Rio Cinema, Dalston, London. Data collection will take place here on four occasions beginning 14 May 2008, subject to ethics approval.
2. Holloway Odeon, London. Data collection will take place here on four occasions, dates to be confirmed.

Informal approval gained from cinema managers. All participants will sign a formal consent form before research begins.

Participants

Give details of the population from which you will be sampling and how this sampling will be done.

I will be conducting go-alongs (see methodology section for description) with eight older-women. Four selected from the audience at the 'classic matinees' held by the Rio Cinema and four selected from the 'senior screen' matinees held by the Holloway Odeon. These events are open to anybody above the age of 60, which means the audiences represent a broad range of ages and levels of mobility. At both cinemas approximately half of the audience is made up of people who have come with care homes and the other half made up of those who have come independently, taking in a wide scope of mental and physical abilities. This impacts

on the routes individuals take to the cinema (ability to take public transport, private car service, Dial-A- Ride and so on) and, I would imagine, affects their experience of the cinema.

Because this is a very small-scale research project, it would be practically impossible, and not necessarily desirable, to adhere to standard sampling procedures. As such, while I will aim to portray the breadth of age, experience and ability presented at these events it is important to note that, with such a small sample size, I am unlikely to succeed in a complete representation. In addition, due to my recruitment procedures (see below) I may end up with a sample weighted toward those women who attend the screenings more regularly and, therefore, have a different relationship to the events compared to those women who either only go occasionally or are there for the first time.

The limits and strengths of my sampling method will be fully acknowledged in my written research. I will discuss the implications of the eventual sample, as well as the impact of any resulting weighting, throughout the analysis of the data to the limitations it places on the claims that can be made from my findings.

Recruitment procedures

How will you identify and approach potential participants?

I will identify potential participants by attending and observing one 'senior screen' matinee and one 'classic matinee'. The organiser at the Rio has agreed to introduce me to potential participants so that I can informally explain the research to them before asking them if they would like to and/or are available to take part, and I aim to use a similar method at the Odeon. This recruitment procedure will be fully acknowledged in the written research, and its strengths and weaknesses discussed. I also intend to undertake interviews with the organisers of the matinees

and have already been in contact with the managers of both cinemas to seek permission to undertake this research.

Consent

Give details of how informed consent will be gained and attach copies of information sheet(s) and consent form(s). Give details of how participants can withdraw consent and what will happen to their data in such a case (see the Research Ethics web site for an advisory document).

I will explain the purpose and nature of my research to all potential participants, and provide them with the attached information sheet, including my contact details and information about withdrawing consent. If they are keen to be involved in the research I will ask them to read the sheet and sign the attached consent form before I carry out a go-along or interview with them. Both documents will be made available in large print in the case of approaching partially sighted individuals.

I will make it clear, in person and on the information sheet, that all participants have the right to withdraw their consent at any time during the research (until 8 September 2008) and that, in such an instance, I would destroy any data held on them and any mention of them in my written research.

Methodology

Outline the method(s) that will be employed to collect and analyse data.

I will be carrying out go-alongs with eight older-women selected from the audience of the 'Senior screen' matinees at Holloway Odeon and the 'classic matinees' at the Rio Cinema. A 'go-along' is a hybrid method that brings together the un-structured interview with ethnographic observation. The aim of the method is to enable interviews to be conducted 'in-situ', so that those questions you might not

think to ask can be prompted by the everyday practices of the participant, and so that spatial cues might prompt participants to talk about specific issues that would seem insignificant in a conventional interview setting.

At a go-along, the participant is asked to talk the researcher through what they are doing while carrying out an everyday practice, in this case cinema-going. I would accompany the participant on their journey to the cinema, during their time at the cinema and then on their journey home from the cinema. Immediately after the film I would also ask them to talk me through how it made them feel and what it meant to them, by way of involving them in the film analyses. For more information on go-alongs see Kusenbach (2003) and Pink (2006).

I will also conduct a more conventional semi-structured interview with each of the organisers of the matinees attended by the women.

I will analyse the data I collect by identifying recurring themes raised by the participants and my own observation. By engaging with Pierre Bourdieu's (1977) analysis of practice I hope to pull out a theoretical analysis of these themes, and explore their meanings, deconstructing naturalised assumptions made about the practice(s) of cinema-going.

Data Protection

Give details of registration of the project under the DP Act and the procedures to be followed re: storage and disposal of data to comply with the Act.

My research will adhere to the 1998 UK Data Protection Act. All participants will be anonymous in my written research. All data related to my empirical research, including electronic recordings of the go-alongs and interviews will be kept in a project folder only on the OU server at <\\hulse\socsci\geography>. This folder will

contain three separate password protected sub-folders one storing personalised identity data, another anonymised data and the other the linkage keys. Only my supervisors and I will have access to these folders.

Any data that is deemed irrelevant or excessive will be destroyed, and any information held on an individual who withdraws their consent will be destroyed immediately.

Any data that is not useful for my PhD will be destroyed after my MRes viva (date tbc). All other data will remain stored in the project folder and sub folders on [\\hulse\socsci\geography](#) and will be used in my PhD.

Recompense to participants

Normally, recompense is only given for expenses and inconvenience, otherwise it might be seen as coercion/inducement to participate. Give details of any recompense to participants.

No recompense will be given to any participants.

Deception

Give details of the withholding of any information from participants, or misrepresentation or other deception that is an integral part of the research. Any such deception should be fully justified.

I will not withhold any information from, or knowingly deceive, participants in my research.

Risks

Detail any foreseen risks to participants or researchers and steps that will be taken to

minimise/counter these.

I cannot foresee any risks, psychological or physical, to either participants or researcher as a result of my proposed research project. Although older people are sometimes considered a vulnerable group, my research involves accompanying them in an activity that they carry out regularly and independently. All interaction with participants will occur in public. I will not enter participants' homes, nor will they enter mine and all usual precautions will be taken to ensure the safety of both participants and researcher. As part of this, I am in the process of acquiring Criminal Records Bureau enhanced disclosure through the Open University.

Although it is not the purpose of the research, I am aware that, because of the nature of the go-alongs, participants may provide some personal, possibly sensitive information. However, I will take measures to avoid this leading to any psychological or emotional damage: I will ensure that participants are aware that they can refuse to answer any questions I ask and that they can ask for me to turn off the recording device at any point during the go-along. Furthermore, if they seem particularly affected by any issue discussed in the go-along, I will gain further consent before using that section in my written research. My aim is for the go-along to be a positive experience for my participants and will make it clear to them that if, at any point, they are finding it difficult or finding my questions too intrusive, they have the right to refuse to answer and/or withdraw from the go-along, without having to give a reason.

I will make it clear to the participants that I am not in a position to offer support or advice but in the event that any issues of concern are raised I will endeavour to pass them on to an appropriate person or organisation. Depending on the issue this might mean contacting social services by getting in touch with the Social Care contact team for the borough in which the participant lives; approaching the

Protection of Vulnerable Adults scheme (POVA) with a concern about a carer (but this could also go through the Social Care contact team); speaking to someone at the cinema or; raising the matter with a carer/care home management. In the unlikely event that a participant discloses something to me that I feel should be passed on, but that they have not raised in asking for advice, I would discuss the matter with them further and explain my concerns before raising it with a relevant party or taking it beyond our conversation. If a participant's behaviour seems confused or I become concerned by their capacity to look after themselves I would discuss my worries with them and suggest that we arrange a visit from the local Social Care team for assessment and support.

To protect their privacy, all participants will be anonymous in my written research. I will not provide any data to third parties, other than that reproduced in my written research, without prior agreement of the participants. As some of my data collection may occur on public transport, and therefore easy for others to hear, I will explain to participants that they can stop talking at any time they feel the topic becomes too personal or requires them to give out information they would like to keep private. Since go-alongs encourage the participant to lead the discussion, I hope that by decreasing the pressure to 'perform' they will predominantly talk about issues they feel comfortable with in places they feel comfortable doing so.

However, I am aware that, as individuals, we do not always consider the repercussions of talking about certain things in public and, as such, I will take measures to stop participants if I feel they are giving out any information that may make them vulnerable, such as personal information including contact details, financial information or information on physical or mental impairments.

No information will be taken that is not freely given, and informed consent will be obtained.

Debriefing

Give details of how information will be given to participants after data collection to inform them of the purpose of their participation and the research more broadly.

I will provide all participants with my contact details so that they can be in touch about the research if they want to know more once it is concluded. On request, I will provide all participants with a transcript of their go-along or interview. Once the research is written up in my dissertation, I will contact participants to see if they would like a copy, or if they would like me to talk them through my findings. I would offer to do this at the next matinee, so that it remains in a shared space in which the participants are comfortable.

Declaration

Declare here that the research will conform to the above protocol and that any significant changes or new issues will be raised with the HPMEC before they are implemented. A Final Report form will need to be filled in once the research has ended.

Signature(s)**Berry Cochrane**

(this can be the typed name(s) of investigator(s) if electronic copy is submitted
(which is preferred))

Date**9 April, 2008****Proposed date for****final report****8 September, 2008**

Appendix I: Personal Information Sheet and Consent Form

Participant information sheet (for go-alongs)

This sheet contains information about the research project 'Growing old at the movies: cinema-going as embodied practice' (working title) that you are being asked to take part in, including details of what that participation might mean for you. It is important that you carefully consider whether or not you wish to take part in my research and understand what your role in that research will be. If, after reading this sheet, you have any questions at all, please do not hesitate to contact me either in person or using the details above.

What is the project? I am interested in looking at what we do when we go to the cinema. In this project, I am focussing on how 'older' or 'ageing' women experience the cinema, what it means to them and how they engage with screenings targeted at the over-60s. I am looking into how cinema-going is about more than just the film that is viewed, and broadening analysis into the wider experience of going to the movies, taking the role of the body into a re-consideration of the politics of cinematic representation.

What is it for? This research will contribute to the dissertation I am producing as part of my Masters degree in research. It may also feed into my work on my subsequent PhD and/or publications.

Who are you? I am a research student with the Geography Department at the Open University, studying for my Masters of research before beginning my PhD with the department next year.

What will I have to do? As part of my research I want to accompany eight women on their trip to a matinee aimed at the over-60s. You are reading this because I would like you to be one of them. Were you to agree, on the day I would meet you on your way to the cinema, at a public place determined by you, go with you to the

matinee and join you on your journey home, leaving you at a public place again determined by you. I would not come to your home, and the research would take place in public.

As I accompanied you on this trip, I would ask you to talk me through what you are doing and why. For example, if you travel on the same route every time you go to the cinema, you might talk through memories you have, or the reason you take certain routes/prefer certain buses etc... I might also ask you questions if I notice something that I am interested in. I will not speak to you during the screening, but once it finishes I will ask you to sit down with me in the cinema café to talk me through how the film made you feel, what you thought of it and any bits that stood out to you. On the return journey I would again ask you to talk me through your actions and ask some questions.

Do I have to take part? Your participation in this research should be entirely voluntary; there is no obligation to take part and there is no payment.

What if I change my mind? You don't have to agree or not on-the-spot. If you are unsure whether to take part or not, feel free to take this sheet with you and contact me on the above details if you decide you would like to be involved. If you agree to take part in the research and change your mind, you can withdraw consent at any time, including after we have been to the cinema together, up until 8 September, 2008 when my dissertation is due in and by which time I will have included any data collected from our trip in my final version. If you withdraw consent after this time, I will destroy any data held from our trip to the cinema but will not be able to destroy the dissertation. If you decide that you do not want to take part in the research and then change your mind, please contact me at the above details and we can arrange a trip to the cinema.

Will people know it is me? Unless you would particularly like your real name to be used, I will ensure that all participants are anonymous in my written dissertation.

How will I benefit? While there will be no direct benefit, I am happy to provide you with a full transcript of our trip to the cinema, and a bound copy of the resulting dissertation on request.

How is the research funded? The Economic Social and Research Council (ESRC) are funding this project, as part of a PhD studentship that begins with a Masters in Research. You can find out more about the ESRC on their website www.esrc.ac.uk, or by calling +44 (0)1793 413 000

Is the research ethical? My research has been reviewed and cleared by the Human Participants and Materials Ethics Committee (HPMEC) at the Open University. Professor Gillian Rose and Professor Kevin Hetherington - my academic supervisors in the Geography Department at the University - have also approved the project.

Who can I contact about the research? In the first instance, concerns, questions or complaints should be directed to me using the above contact details. However, if you do not feel comfortable using this route, or if you wish to complain about me, then please contact my supervisors Professor Gillian Rose (g.rose@open.ac.uk) and Professor Kevin Hetherington (K.i.hetherington@open.ac.uk) by email or phone (+44 (0)1908 654 456).

What now? If, having read this sheet, you are willing to take part in my research, please read and sign the attached consent form. We can then arrange when you go on our trip to the cinema.

I do hope you choose to take part in my research, and thank you for taking the time to read this sheet.

Consent Form

Working title: Growing old at the movies – cinema as embodied practice

Researcher: Berry Cochrane

To ensure that I have your informed consent for your participation in my research, please read the statements below and tick the boxes to confirm where appropriate. If you are unsure about any of the statements on this form, please do not hesitate to ask me any questions you have.

1. I have read and understood the participant information sheet for the above study and have the opportunity to ask questions.

☐

2. I understand that my participation is voluntary and I that I am free to withdraw at any time using the contact details above, without giving reason.

☐

3. I agree to take part in the study named above, on the terms outlined in the participant information sheet.

☐

4. I agree to our trip to the cinema being audio recorded.

☐

5. I agree to the use of quotes being used in a Masters dissertation, PhD and any resulting publications.

☐

6. I would like/would not like for my name to be changed in the written research (please delete as appropriate)

Participant: _____ **Signed:** _____ **Date** _____

Researcher: _____ **Signed:** _____ **Date** _____